‘IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE ANCIENTS’: THE ORIGINS OF HUMANISM FROM LOVATO TO BRUNI

Ronald G. Witt

BRILL

‘IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE ANCIENTS’

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION THOUGHT

EDITED BY

HEIKO A. OBERMAN, Tucson, Arizona

IN COOPERATION WITH

THOMAS A. BRADY, Jr., Berkeley, California
ANDREW C. GOW, Edmonton, Alberta
SUSAN C. KARANT-NUNN, Tucson, Arizona
JÜRGEN MIETHKE, Heidelberg
M. E. H. NICOLETTE MOUT, Leiden
ANDREW PETTEGREE, St. Andrews
MANFRED SCHULZE, Wuppertal

VOLUME LXXIV

RONALD G. WITT

'IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE ANCIENTS'

‘IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE ANCIENTS’

THE ORIGINS OF HUMANISM FROM LOVATO TO BRUNI

BY

RONALD G. WITT

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2001

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Witt, Ronald G.
'In the footsteps of the ancients' : the origins of humanism from Lovato to Bruni / by Ronald G. Witt.
p. cm. — (Studies in medieval and Reformation thought, ISSN 0585-6914 ; v. 74)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 9004113975 (alk. paper)
1. Lovati, Lovato de, d. 1309. 2. Bruni, Leonardo, 1369-1444. 3. Latin literature, Medieval and modern—Italy—History and criticism. 4. Latin literature, Medieval and modern—France—History and criticism. 5. Latin literature, Medieval and modern—Classical influences. 6. Rhetoric, Ancient—Study and teaching—History—To 1500. 7. Humanism in literature. 8. Humanists—France. 9. Humanists—Italy. 10. Italy—Intellectual life 1268-1559. 11. France—Intellectual life—To 1500.
PA8045.I6 W58 2000
808'.0945'09023—dc21 00–023546
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Witt, Ronald G.:
'In the footsteps of the ancients' : the origins of humanism from Lovato to Bruni / by Ronald G. Witt. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2000
(Studies in medieval and reformation thought ; Vol. 74)
ISBN 90–04–11397–5

ISSN 0585-6914
ISBN 90 04 11397 5

© Copyright 2000 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vii

Abbreviations xi

Chapter One Introduction 1

Chapter Two The Birth of the New Aesthetic 31

Chapter Three Padua and the Origins of Humanism 81

Chapter Four Albertino Mussato and the Second Generation 117

Chapter Five Florence and Vernacular Learning 174

Chapter Six Petrarch, Father of Humanism? 230

Chapter Seven Coluccio Salutati 292

Chapter Eight The Revival of Oratory 338

Chapter Nine Leonardo Bruni 392

Chapter Ten The First Ciceronianism 443

Chapter Eleven Conclusion 495

Appendix 509

Bibliography 515

Indexes
- Index of Persons 549
- Index of Places 556
- Index of Subjects 558

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In memoriam
Paul Oskar Kristeller (1905-1999)
Sibi et post eum ascendere volentibus viam aperuit.

In the course of the twenty-three years since I first conceived of taking up this project, I have depended heavily on the generosity of a large intellectual community in multifarious ways, but because this volume embodies only half of the original design, I postpone mentioning those who contributed principally to the still unfinished first and earlier part. The present book could not have been written without the expert advice of Francis Newton and Diskin Clay of Duke's Department of Classical Studies. In the case of Francis Newton, my debt goes back to the beginning of my research on early humanism and before. James Hankins, John Headley, Kenneth Gouwens, Riccardo Fubini, Majorie Curry Woods, and Paul Gaziano read the entire manuscript, each at different stages of its development. Francesca Santoro L'Hoir, Giuseppe Mazzotta, Timothy Kircher, and Marcello Simonetta willingly gave their comments on chapters 3, 5, 6, and 10 respectively. On specific points I had recourse to the expertise and assistance of Felicia Traub, Patricia Osmond, Robert Bjork, Peter Burian, Mark Sosower, Lucia Stadter, and Edward Mahoney. I am deeply grateful to all these scholars for the corrections and improvements they have made. A presentation of a late version of the manuscript in one of the Duke History Department's "Conversations with Colleagues" was extremely profitable, as was a similar presentation to the Triangle Intellectual History Seminar.

I am deeply in debt to two decades of Duke University Staff members: Dorothy Sapp and Betty Cowan in the 1980s and Jenna Golnik, Andrea Long, and Deborah Carver in the 1990s. Without them I would never have gotten through the series of emergencies plaguing a sometimes absent-minded and technologically naive researcher. Of the dozens of libraries I have visited over the years, I would like to single out for special thanks the staffs of the Bibliothèque nationale of Paris, the Biblioteca nazionale and Biblioteca riccardiana of Florence, the libraries of the American Academy in Rome and Harvard's Villa I Tatti in Florence, the Newberry Library, the Biblioteca

apostolica vaticana, and the Duke Library, especially the staff of Special Collections. I would also like to thank Professor Heiko A. Oberman for accepting this book in his series *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought.* Gera van Bedaf, my editor at Brill, was a pleasure to work with. Her professionalism, efficiency and tolerance in this enterprise were remarkable.

In the last stages of compiling the bibliography, I relied heavily on the research skills of my undergraduate assistant at Duke, Robert Shibley. Christopher Ross, Walker Robinson, and Philip Tinari helped with proofing. Mark Jurdevic prepared the indexes with intelligence and dispatch. I would especially like to express my deep appreciation for the work of Andrew Sparling, who served as the copyeditor of the manuscript, but whose real contribution extended much further, to the mode of presentation and to the ideas themselves. The general argument, even if necessarily specialized at points, has been rendered far more accessible to a general audience by his having taken it in hand. He could not have been more concerned with the quality of the final version had it been his own work. Finally, I want to thank my family: my three children – for whom the dictates of writing such a book contributed significantly to the context in which they spent much of their youth – performed over time various services too numerous to mention; and my wife of thirty-five years, who has always stood in the front line when it came to testing out my ideas or exploring ways of expressing them. Over the years my research has been generously supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities and by a number of foundations. A Guggenheim Fellowship in 1978-79 and a summer grant from the Council of Learned Societies helped me in the initial stages of research. Subsequently, I received a National Endowment for the Humanities for a semester's study in 1983 at the National Humanities Center in the Research Triangle; a second for a semester at the Newberry Library in 1991 and a third (with a generous salary supplement from Duke) for a year's residence at the American Academy in Rome. A Fulbright-for-Research-in-Two-Countries supported me for a year in Rome and Paris in 1985-86. Five grants from the Duke University Research Council were used for the purchase of microfilm. I can only hope that the results of this study and the one forthcoming will in some measure justify the expenditure of these precious resources.

I dedicate this book to the memory of Paul Oskar Kristeller, whose magisterial writings instilled in me the fundamental principle guiding

all my work: that an appreciation of the distinctiveness of the Italian Renaissance cannot be had apart from an understanding of the medieval culture out of which it developed. Mine is only one of many testimonies to Kristeller's enormous contribution to the study of medieval and Renaissance culture. Those of us in this field can fittingly attribute to his achievement the assessment Boccaccio rendered of Petrarch's in his letter to Jacopo Pizzinga in 1372: "He has opened the road for himself and for those who want to ascend after him."

R.W.
Durham, North Carolina
February 2000

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS

ASF	Archivo di Stato, Florence
BAM	Biblioteca ambrosiana, Milan.
BAV	Biblioteca apostolica, Vatican City.
BCS	Biblioteca columbaria, Seville.
BL	British Library.
BLF	Biblioteca laurenziana, Florence.
BMF	Biblioteca magliabechiana, Florence.
BMV	Biblioteca marciana, Venice.
BNF	Biblioteca nazionale, Florence.
BNN	Biblioteca nazionale, Naples.
BNP	Bibliothèque nationale, Paris.
BRF	Biblioteca riccardiana, Florence.
DBI	*Dizionario bibliographico italiano.*
DGI	*De gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII Cesarem*, in Mussato, *Opera*, q.v., fasc. 2, 1–112.
FSI	Fonti per la storia d'Italia.
HA	*Historia augusta* or *De gestis Henrici septem Cesaris*, in Mussato, *Opera*, q.v., fasc. l, 1–94.
IMU	*Italia medioevale e umanistica.*
LB	*Ludovicus Bavarus ad filium*, in Mussato, *Opera*, q.v., fasc. 3, 1–10.
LI 1	*Il letterato e le istituzioni*, in *Letteratura italiana*, ed. A. Asor Rosa, vol. 1 (Turin, 1982).
LI 5	*Le questioni*, in *Letteratura italiana*, vol. 5 (Turin, 1986).
LI 6	*Teatro, musica, tradizione dei classici*, in *Letteratura italiana*, vol. 6 (Turin, 1986).
LI 7.1	*Storia e geografia: L'età medievale*, in *Letteratura italiana*, vol. 7.1 (Turin, 1987).
Megas, *Kuklos Padouas*	Anastasio Megas, *Ο προουμανιστικὸς κὺκλος τῆς Πάδουας (Lovato Lovati – Alberto Mussato) καὶ οἱ τραγῳδίες τοῦ L.A. Seneca* (Salonica, 1967).
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historiae*
Miss.	Archivio di Stato, Florence, Signoria, Carteggi, I Canc., *Missive.*

Mussato, *Opera*	*Albertini Mussati: Historia augusta Henrici VII Caesaris et alia quae extant opera*, Laurentii Pignorii vir. clar. spicilegio necnon Foelici Osii et Nicolae Villani etc. (Venice, l636).
Petrarch, *Familiar Letters*	Francesco Petrarch, vol. 1, *Rerum familiarium libri I–VIII* (Albany, N.Y., 1975); vol.2, *Rerum familiarium libri IX–XVI: Letters on Familiar Matters* (Baltimore and London, 1982); vol. 3, *Rerum familiarium libri XVII-XXIV: Letters on Familiar Matters* (Baltimore and London, 1985); all vols. trans. Aldo S. Bernardo. English text of Petrarch, *Rerum familiarium.*
Petrarch, *Familiari*, 1–4	Francesco Petrarch, *Le familiari*, 4 vols.; vols. 1–3 ed. Vittorio Rossi, vol. 4 ed. Vittorio Rossi and Umberto Bosco; Edizione nazionale di Petrarca, vols. 10–13 (Rome, 1933–42). Latin text of Petrarch, *Rerum familiarium.*
Petrarch, *Letters of Old Age*	Francesco Petrarch, *Letters of Old Age (Rerum senilium libri I–XVIII)*, 2 vols., ed. A Bernardo, S. Levin, and R.A. Bernardo, (Baltimore, 1992).
Petrarch, *Prose*	Francesco Petrarch, *Prose*, ed. G. Martellotti, P.G. Ricci, E. Carrara, and E. Bianchi (Milan and Naples, 1955).
PL	*Patrologia latina.*
Prosatori	Eugenio Garin, *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* (Milan and Naples, 1952).
RIS	*Rerum Italicarum Scriptores.*
Sabbadini, *Scoperte*	Remigio Sabbadini, *Le Scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1905 and 1914); reprographic rpt., ed. E. Garin (Florence, 1967).
Salutati, *Epist.*, 1–4	Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati, ed. F. Novati, 4 vols., in *FSI*, vols. 15–18 (Rome, l891–1911).
SCV 1	*Storia della cultura veneta: Dalle origini al Trecento* (Vicenza, 1976).
SCV 2	*Storia della cultura veneta: Il Trecento* (Vicenza, 1976).

SCV 3	*Storia della cultura veneta: Il Quattrocento* (Vicenza, 1980).
Vergerio, *Epist.*	*Epistolario di Pier Paolo Vergerio*, ed. L. Smith (Rome, 1934), in *FSI*, vol. 74 (Rome, 1934).
Witt, *Hercules*	Ronald G. Witt, *Hercules at the Crossroads: The Life, Works, and Thought of Coluccio Salutati* (Durham, 1983).
Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*	Ronald G. Witt, *Coluccio Salutati and His Public Lettters* (Geneva, 1976).

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

From the twelfth to the early sixteenth century, the major lay intellectuals of western Europe were in Italy. Whereas elsewhere on the subcontinent ecclesiastics controlled educational institutions and intellectual life generally, in Italy, primarily in the northern and central parts of the peninsula, laymen played a major role from the early twelfth century and became dominant after 1300. Lay intellectuals were largely associated in earlier centuries with legal studies, but after 1300 there emerged an intellectual movement, Italian humanism, which ultimately established laymen's lives as equal in moral value to those of clerics and monks. The methods and goals of humanist education, already well-defined by the early fifteenth century, were to become the underpinnings of elite education in western Europe down to the nineteenth.

Despite the central importance of the humanist movement for the evolution of western European society, the present study maintains that our current understanding of the first century and a half of its development has been misconceived in a number of significant ways. A serious re-examination of humanism's early history makes it possible to understand its genesis, its subsequent development to the mid-fifteenth century, and the distinctive characteristics that set it off from its earlier analogue, usually referred to as "twelfth-century French humanism." A brief chronology of my own thinking on the subject should serve to explain the reasons for my dissatisfaction with contemporary scholarship on the origins and early stages of humanism and to illuminate the approach that I have taken to the problem.

My original interest in the issues of humanism's origins and growth was sparked by Paul Oskar Kristeller's classic definition of the Italian humanists as essentially rhetoricians and heirs to the tradition of the medieval *dictatores*. In contrast with the tendency of previous scholars to speak generally of humanism as offering a philosophy of life, Kristeller developed a definition of humanism based on the professional role of the humanists in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century

Italian society.[1] He argued that the humanists usually worked as teachers of rhetoric and grammar or served as notaries and lawyers. The latter two professional groups were charged with writing letters and making speeches on behalf of political powers. They were not philosophers but instead specialized in rhetoric, grammar, history, and ethics, areas of learning reflected in the kinds of issues they wrote about.[2] According to Kristeller, perhaps the only philosophical idea that they all shared was a belief in the dignity of the human being, and this conviction usually emerged only as an implicit assumption in their work.[3] Professionally, Kristeller maintained, the humanists of the Italian Renaissance played the same role in their society as did the *dictatores* of the Middle Ages in theirs: they were rhetoricians who served as public officials in princely and communal chanceries and taught grammar and rhetoric in the schools. Concerned as were their predecessors primarily with the art of letter writing and the composition and delivery of speeches, the humanists differed from their medieval counterparts, nevertheless, in relying on models drawn from classical texts.[4]

Over the last fifty years, Kristeller's analysis of humanism has advanced scholarly discussion of the movement by stressing the importance of understanding the medieval intellectual culture out of which humanism arose, especially the traditions of the disciplines in which the humanists worked and of the genres of writing that they employed. Kristeller's definition failed to account for Petrarch and Boccaccio, the two great leaders of Trecento humanism, who neither taught nor served as public officials; it also excluded from considera-

[1] His original statement of the thesis is found in "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance," *Byzantion* 17 (1944–45): 346–74, most recently published in *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, ed. M. Mooney (New York, 1979), 85–105. My references will be to the latter version.

[2] For Kristeller's enumeration of the basic *studia humanitatis*, see his "The Humanist Movement," *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, esp. 22, and in the same volume, "Humanism and Scholasticism," 92 and 98. For his detailed discussion of humanist achievements in these disciplines, see esp. 25–31 and 92–98.

[3] Kristeller, "The Humanist Movement," 32.

[4] He recognizes that humanism had an important grammatical component and suggests that the medieval French grammatical tradition was one of its sources. He particularly stresses the role of the French practice of textual commentary: *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance* (Stanford, 1964), 160–62. Cf. "Humanism and Scholasticism," 91 and 96–97. Nevertheless, he insists that professionally the humanists were rhetoricians and the successors of the medieval *dictatores*: "The Humanist Movement," 23–24. Cf. "Humanism and Scholasticism," 92–93.

tion the many private individuals after 1400 who never used their humanistic training to earn a living.[5] The studies of Charles Trinkaus and others on the religious and philosophic interests of the humanists, moreover, have accented the humanists' philosophical and religious interests more than did Kristeller's works.[6] In William Bouwsma's opinion, the narrow focus of Kristeller on the humanists' contribution to specific areas of the traditional educational curriculum has tended to "have the unintended effect of reducing our perception of its rich variety and thus of limiting our grasp of its historical significance."[7] Nonetheless, Kristeller's characterization of the humanists, the scope of their interests, and their role in society has survived largely intact because it integrated most of the phenomena associated with the movement.

Kristeller was more interested in describing humanism than in explaining its etiology. In fact, he only suggested in passing two possible causes for its origin: the influence of grammatical interests imported from France late in the thirteenth century and the revival of a

[5] Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism," 93, recognized that the two did not fit his definition, but in "Petrarcas Stellung in der Geschichte der Gelehrsamkeit," *Italien und die Romania in Humanismus und Renaissance: Festschrift für Erich Loos zum 70 Geburtstage*, ed. K.W. Kempfer and E. Straub (Wiesbaden, 1983), 104, he partly justifies his position by pointing out that Petrarch occasionally performed tasks associated with a professional *dictator* for the Visconti, Carrara, Colonna, and perhaps also the Correggio families.

[6] Among the early humanists, these scholars single out Salutati and Valla as having philosophical interests. Among the writings of Charles Trinkaus on the subject, see especially "Coluccio Salutati's Critique of Astrology in the Context of His Natural Philosophy," *Speculum* 64 (1989): 46–68; and "Lorenzo Valla's Anti-Aristotelian Natural Philosophy," *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 5 (1993): 279–325. See also Salvatore Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla, Umanesimo e Teologia* (Florence, 1972); and my *Hercules*, 313–54.

Kristeller states his position most clearly in "The Philosophy of Man in the Italian Renaissance," *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains* (New York, 1961), 138: "The humanistic movement which in its origin was not philosophical provided the general and still vague ideas and aspirations as well as the ancient source materials. The Platonists and Aristotelians, who were professional philosophers with speculative interests and training, took up those vague ideas, developed them into definite philosophical doctrines, and assigned them an important place in their elaborate metaphysical systems."

[7] William J. Bouwsma, "The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought," *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of Its European Transformations: Dedicated to Paul Oskar Kristeller on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman with Thomas A. Brady, Jr. (Leiden, 1975), 3. Cf. Kenneth Gouwens, "Perceiving the Past: Renaissance Humanism after the 'Cognitive Turn,'" *American Historical Review* 103 (1998): 58.

concern with ancient literature and history occurring at the same time in the Veneto, particularly at Padua. To his mind, humanism appeared to have resulted from the Italians' combination of a domesticated French grammatical tradition with an evolving local rhetorical orientation.[8]

Kristeller's reluctance to be more precise about the origins of humanism is not untypical of scholarship on the Renaissance over the last fifty years. Impressed with the complexity of major historical changes, modern scholars have largely refrained from making more than modest suggestions about which factors may have given rise to a movement of humanism's scope. The search for humanism's origins, moreover, blends easily into the wider pursuit of the origins of the Italian Renaissance as a whole, the broader problem on which the narrower one intimately depends.[9] Before such a challenge, humility would seem the proper attitude. My own account does not offer an explanation for the Renaissance but rather is concerned only with the development of humanism. My argument is that the advent of humanism was intimately connected with the broad, longterm changes in Italian political, economic, social, and cultural life that were creating the first early modern European society. The move-

[8] Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism," 97. Kristeller describes France as exercising leadership in the Middle Ages in the study of ancient Roman literature, in the composition of Latin poetry, and in theology. Until the late thirteenth century, in his view, Italy focused its scholarly concern on practical subjects like law and medicine. The Italian rhetorical interests of the medieval period were likewise practical, focusing on the composition of speeches for political occasions and letters devoted to business. Kristeller considers humanism as arising from "a fusion between the novel interest in classical studies imported from France toward the end of the thirteenth century and the much earlier traditions of medieval Italian rhetoric" (ibid., 97, with notes). B.L. Ullman, "Some Aspects of the Origin of Italian Humanism," in his *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1973), 29–31, places the contact a few decades later, emphasizing the importance of Avignon in bringing Italians into contact with French classical culture. Without specifically focusing on Italian humanism, J. Nordström, *Moyen âge et Renaissance: Essai historique*, trans. T. Hammar (Paris, 1933), stresses the general influence of French art and the French language, *chansons de geste*, romances, and goliardic poetry on thirteenth-century Italian culture. Cf. Paul Renucci, *L'aventure de l'humanisme européen au moyen âge (IVe–XIV siècle)* (Paris, 1953), 138–172. Franco Simone, "Medieval French Culture and Italian Humanism," in *The French Renaissance*, trans. H. Gaston Hall (London, 1969), 279–90, stresses the importance of Avignon as a center for the transmission of French culture to Italians.

[9] An example of a contemporary effort to deal with both problems at once is George Holmes, *Florence, Rome and the Origins of the Renaissance* (Oxford, 1986). Although skillfully relating artistic and intellectual developments with a focus on the first decade of the fourteenth century, Holmes's account is essentially descriptive.

ment served, first of all, to promote the transformation and second, to validate the new society's achievements.

Coming to Europe in the fall of 1978 on a Guggenheim Fellowship in search of humanism's origins, I spent most of the following year of research continuing my study of the writings of the *dictatores*: manuals of letter writing (*artes dictaminis*), which date from the late eleventh century, and manuals of speech composition (*artes arengandi*), beginning in the early thirteenth century. Included in my reading as well were the remnants of other writings by *dictatores*, together with a selection of handbooks for composing sermons (*artes predicandi*), whose composition dates in Italy from the early thirteenth century.

By the end of the year, it became clear to me that the connection between fourteenth-century humanists and *dictatores* of the previous century lay in the stylistic continuity of public rhetoric: humanists who wrote official letters and gave speeches continued to use medieval rhetorical forms.[10] In fact, until the late fourteenth century, in their professional work as chancery officials or teachers of rhetoric, humanists carried forward medieval rhetorical traditions of expression and, in some cases, they even composed treatises on *ars dictaminis*.

In contrast, significant stylistic changes in the direction of imitating ancient rhetoric occurred in those writings composed by humanists as private individuals. Even here, though, change did not happen simultaneously across all genres of prose composition. Not surprisingly, the last to be reformed were the oration and the public letter, genres of primary concern to *dictatores*. While Kristeller was right to present the humanists as professionally the heirs of the *dictatores*, the continuity that the humanists forged, at least until about 1400, rested on their persistent embrace of medieval rhetorical forms. Insofar as they were humanists, these fourteenth-century chancellors and teachers owed little or nothing to the tradition of *ars dictaminis*.[11]

On my return from France, my reading of Quentin Skinner's *Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, which argues that a change in Italian *ars dictaminis* led to the birth of humanism, helped me clarify

[10] For the meaning of "public," see below, n. 19.

[11] At the most, experience with *dictamen* would have served to guide Tuscan and Bolognese *dictatores* to focus on translations of ancient prose rather than poetry and sharpened their sensitivity to language and expression.

my own thoughts.[12] Skinner argues that French medieval classicism affected French *ars dictaminis* and in turn Italian *dictatores*. The argument rests on a series of misconceptions about the relationships of French to Italian *dictamen* and of Italian *dictamen* to Italian humanism.[13] My critique of his analysis led me to define more clearly the interrelationship (or more properly, the lack of one) between humanism and the two schools of *dictamen*.

By 1981, besides having concluded that humanism had not arisen as an offshoot of *dictamen*, I had arrived at three further conclusions: first, that humanism did not invade all literary genres simultaneously, but rather successively coopted one genre after another over almost two centuries; second, that the order of penetration was not a matter of happenstance, but that for reasons both intrinsic to the genre and arising from cultural precedent, the first genre affected was poetry; and third, that, because it began in poetry, the origins of humanism were to be found not in rhetoric but in grammar, the traditional

[12] Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (New York and London, 1978).

[13] Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:35–39, maintains that contact with French *ars dictaminis*, heavily influenced by twelfth-century French classicism, led Italian *dictatores* (he mentions Jacques de Dinant and Latini as examples) living in France to reform the practical rhetoric of Italian dictaminal tradition. Latini is specifically designated as encountering Cicero's rhetorical writings there "for the first time," an encounter that convinced him "to introduce a far more literary and classical flavour into his own writings in *Ars Dictaminis*" (37). The introduction of this "classical" rhetoric, Skinner claims, led students, among them Mussato and Geri d'Arezzo, back to the ancient texts (37–38). First of all, Jacques de Dinant was not Italian, and the Ciceronian rhetorical texts that Skinner mentions, the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium*, had circulated in Italy throughout the medieval period. Although Latini has long been recognized as influenced by Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum* when writing his encyclopedic *Tresor*, there is no evidence that he was influenced by French *dictamen* practices. Aristide Marigo, "Cultura letteraria e preumanistica nelle maggiori enciclopedie del Duecento," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 68 (1916): 1–42, and 289–326, discusses Latini's sources. Pons of Provence in the mid-thirteenth century was the last important French *dictator* and he gave short shrift to the ancients. Subsequently, Italian authors, Faba, Bene, and Boncompagno, dominated the moribund *ars* in France. Thus, the influence of the dictaminal traditions was the reverse of that maintained by Skinner. As for the effect of Latini's French classical experience on *dictamen*, until after 1350 (and even then rarely) it would be difficult to find ancient authors cited in *dictamen* texts. *Stilus humilis* dominate Italian *dictamen* after 1250. Skinner never explains how Mussato and Geri relate to *dictamen*, but in any case, we shall see that Lovato, a member of Latini's generation, was the major contemporary influence on Mussato, and Lovato's genre was poetry. By contrast, I will suggest a much earlier influence of French classicism, beginning in the 1180s. By Latini's time, Italians were moving away from French influences.

domain for poetry.[14] I only gradually understood the tremendous significance of this fact for the interpretation of the movement. Accordingly, over the next seven years I sought to trace the grammatical tradition in medieval Italian culture. The preliminary results of my investigation, published in 1988 in an article entitled "The Origins of Humanism as a Stylistic Ideal," were as follows:[15]

As historically defined in western Europe, grammar and rhetoric constituted two very different centers around which to organize education and ultimately a way of life. The two disciplines first emerged in the Greco-Roman system of education. As it existed in the golden days of the Roman Empire in the first century B.C.E. and the first century of the Christian era, the curriculum of the schools treated rhetoric as the superior discipline in the educational hierarchy. The task of the grammarian was to prepare the student to pass on to the school of rhetoric, where he could learn the subject that would enable him to participate fully in the political life of the state. Although subordinate, grammatical studies provided students with skills that extended beyond the requirements for entering the school of rhetoric; in this way, the grammarian managed to promote some of his own intellectual interests.[16]

The grammarian began his educational program on the assumption that his charges had learned the elements of reading and writing from the *ludi magister*, the elementary school teacher. The grammari-

[14] Two articles of John O'Malley, "Grammar and Rhetoric in the *Pietas* of Erasmus," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988): 81–98, and "Egidio da Viterbo, O.S.A. e il suo tempo," *Studia augustiniana historica* 9 (1983): 68–84, both dealing with the distinctive concerns and interests of the grammarian and rhetorician in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, helped clarify my views. Although the text of the first article was only published in 1988, Prof. O'Malley made it (initially prepared for another journal) available to me years earlier. This work also brought to my attention O.B. Hardison's "The Orator and the Poet: The Dilemma of Humanist Literature," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1971): 33–44, which elaborates on the contrasts between the poet and the orator.

[15] The article was published in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1988), 1:29–70.

[16] S.F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (Berkeley, 1977), 189ff., especially 250. See also H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. G. Lamb (New York, 1956), 223–42 and 267–81. Bonner, 218–19, suggests that ancient grammarians may have used prose works to provide students with initial exercises in composition, but that they did not indulge in the detailed analysis of prose as they did for poetry. G.A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963), 269, acknowledges some overlap but considers the study of poets to have belonged principally to the school of grammar and that of the prose writers to the school of rhetoric.

an's own task was to give the student a good understanding of Latin grammar, an appreciation of literature, and initial training in the art of composition. At the outset, detailed study was devoted to the letters of the alphabet, the syllables, and the parts of speech. Selections from the poets served as the basis for a minute examination of syntax and provided the students with an introduction to literary analysis. In the course of a line-by-line study of a poem, the grammarian discussed the author's biography, the historical and mythological references found in the work, the metric, the etymology of the vocabulary, and the various figures of speech that the poet used. He taught the student to search for truth hidden beneath a veil of imagery. Close study of the text incidentally revealed discrepancies in different copies and thereby encouraged the grammarian to engage in textual criticism.

The student left the grammar school with some experience in reciting poetry and composing short pieces of prose, but delivery and longer prose composition were to be the main objectives of his training from then on. The rhetor set his students to imitating the great prose writers of the culture, especially the orators. Students learned to declaim, debate, and deliver orations of their own making. Success at such assignments augured well for their future standing in elite ancient society.

The educational programs of the grammar and rhetorical schools were linked. The rhetor presupposed grammatical training in his students: the rules of prosody learned earlier facilitated the mastering of prose metric required for orations, and appropriate citations from the poets proved a vital ingredient in making an impressive speech. The grammarian, for his part, used some prose texts in his instruction, and interpretation of the poets could not have been made without help of the *colores rhetorici* borrowed from the rhetor. Students had to understand the figures of thought and style, tropes, and commonplaces in order to interpret clearly both the outer and inner meanings of poetry.

In his dependence on devices of rhetoric to accomplish his ends, the grammarian resorted to what George Kennedy calls "secondary rhetoric."[17] For Kennedy, "primary rhetoric" is the art of speech-

[17] G.A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill, 1980), 4–5, establishes the distinction between primary and secondary rhetoric. Marjorie Curry Wood, "The Teaching of Writing in Medieval Europe," in *A Short History of Writing Instruction from Ancient Greece to Twentieth-*

making and develops out of the needs of public life. It includes speeches, impromptu and written, and, I would add, at least for the ancient and medieval periods, public letters that were delivered orally and therefore qualified as speeches. From late antiquity, sermons also constituted an important form of oratorical expression. Under "secondary rhetoric" Kennedy groups all other literary genres, for example, history, private correspondence, poetry, and philosophical discussion when it has literary pretensions. In this wider arena, rhetoric relates to invention, arrangement, and especially to style – in other words, to the particular selection of words and their order, chosen by the author whether he is writing prose or poetry.

While I follow Kennedy's division between two categories of rhetoric in this book, I am unable to accept his terminology of "primary" and "secondary." Not only is it difficult to prove that "primary rhetoric" historically preceded "secondary rhetoric," i.e., that oratory came before poetry, but also the claim, implicit in the terminology, that oration enjoyed a privileged position as a form of verbal expression, while true for antiquity, cannot be extended to Europe in the Middle Ages or Renaissance. Retaining Kennedy's two descriptive categories, consequently, I have preferred to label them "oratorical rhetoric" and "literary rhetoric." While I acknowledge that oratorical discourse was also in a sense literary, I have chosen to make "oratorical rhetoric" a separate category, because unlike other genres of rhetoric, it was a prose that aimed at public, oral expression.[18]

To privilege oration as essentially "public" and to imply that other literary genres are "private" is to claim less than might at first appear.

Century America, ed. James J. Murphy (Davis, Calif., 1990), 77–94, points out convincingly that Kennedy's terminology as well as his description of the relationship of the two rhetorics implicitly subordinates "secondary rhetoric" to "primary rhetoric." She suggests that the terminology be reversed and oratory be seen as a subset of what Kennedy defines as "secondary rhetoric." Although the unique history of oratorical expression in early humanism cautions me against embracing this suggestion, the cogency of her critique of Kennedy's terminology, which I had earlier accepted (see my "Origins," 31), has led me to develop another way of describing the two rhetorics.

[18] The early Italian humanists did not make the distinction between two kinds of rhetoric that I make here. Of the medieval Italian *dictatores*, only Boncompagno felt the distinctiveness of oratory from other forms of verbal expression. In fact, he identified oratory with rhetoric and resisted the efforts of the *grammatici* at transforming orations into literary compositions. He sharply distinguished between *oratores*, *grammatici*, and *dialectici* (see my "Boncompagno and the Defense of Rhetoric," *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 [1986]: 7–13).

All literary genres have the potential to inform opinion on issues of public concern. It is obvious that even in a premodern world, where public and private power intermingled and the institutions and technology for the creation of "public opinion" were lacking, those making decisions for the whole community could be influenced by whatever they read or heard.[19] My justification for referring to oration as *the* genre of public rhetoric resides primarily in the nature of the forums in which the author intended or imagined his work would be received and only secondarily in the purpose informing its writing. Always composed with its presentation before some kind of public assembly in mind, the oration was usually – but not necessarily – concerned with some matter regarding civic culture or political affairs.[20]

Besides conceiving of rhetoric as oratorical or literary, I would add that it can also be more broadly considered as a way of thought that informs both oratorical and literary rhetoric. It is a form of reasoning that seeks conclusions by inference rather than by demonstration and whose weapon is more often the enthymeme than the syllogism.[21] As

[19] Since the publication of Jürgen Habermas's *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1962), the discussion of the creation of an "authentic public sphere" in eighteenth-century Europe has led to numerous analyses of the public and private spheres of life in the medieval and early modern periods. Among the most important are *Public and Private in Social Life*, ed. S. I. Benn and G. F. Graus (London, 1983); G. Duby, "Ouverture: Pouvoir privé, pouvoir public," *Historie de la vie privée*, ed. Georges Duby and Philippe Ariès, 5 vols. (Paris, 1985–87), 2:19–44; Dena Goodman, "Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime," *History and Theory*, 31 (1992): 1–20; *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, Mass., 1992); Anthony J. La Vopa, "Conceiving a Public: Ideas and Society in Eighteenth-Century Europe," *Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992): 79–116; and Giorgio Chittolini, "Il 'privato,' il 'pubblico,' lo Stato," in *Origini dello stato. Processi di formazione statale in Italia fra medioevo ed età moderna*, ed. Giorgio Chittolini, Anthony Molho, and Pierangelo Schiera (Bologna, 1994), 553–90.

[20] For the ancients, all oration, even the funeral oration, was essentially connected with political and civic life. The revival of ancient oratorical forms by the humanists in the Renaissance was accompanied by the same tendency. Prolusions to university courses perhaps constituted exceptions to the rule. Also, if sermons are considered to be orations, they constitute a problem for that part of my definition concerning the focus on public matters. Given the close connection between secular and ecclesiastical affairs, the sermon criticizing not only secular but also ecclesiastical government could be considered as speaking to public issues, but most sermons pertained to the relationship of the believers and their god.

[21] The contrast here is between a means of proof in which probable premises are used in order to establish a probable conclusion and a means of proof in which two premises are used to deduce a logical conclusion.

such, rhetoric not only contrasts with Aristotelian dialectic but also with the grammarian's favored pursuit of knowledge through etymological distinctions, glosses of texts, analogy, and allegory.

While in reality interdependence must be acknowledged, it is meaningful to see the grammarian–poet and the rhetorician–orator as representing two poles of attraction, one or the other of which characterizes the dominant tendencies operative in many individual writers and movements. The contrast between the grammarian and the rhetorician highlights two different approaches to knowledge and, potentially, two contrasting ways of life.

Outside the classroom, the grammarian in his own work remains a student of texts, a philologist, a specialist in mythology. He finds pleasure in treating the smallest details of a poem, eager to find there a word or phrase that can unveil a general truth of natural, moral, or theological import. He delights in allegory. The poet is himself a grammarian who feels the need to express the movements of his emotions and thoughts through verbal images. Whether as creative artist or as philologist, the grammarian requires the quiet of the study or of solitary places. He leads a private life, a *vita contemplativa*, and the audience for his work ranges from a group of specialists to a relatively small elite with literary tastes.

By contrast, the life of the rhetorician is the *vita activa*, aimed ideally at the achievement of practical goals. Essentially an orator, he best realizes his objectives in public assemblies or the marketplace. Admittedly, to exercise his profession he needs the technical preparation that the grammarian provides, but grammatical learning, primarily knowledge of the poets, provides only raw material for his speeches. He remains uninterested in obscure meanings or hidden messages: his concern is clarity and his goal is action.

Both within the system of education and in terms of the rewards given by society at large, the rhetorician or orator of the first centuries before and after Christ was superior in standing to the grammarian, and that hierarchy endured in ancient culture long after the political institutions that justified it had vanished. With the collapse of the empire and the disappearance of an extensive public capable of understanding an oration delivered in ancient Latin, the rhetorician lost his preeminence and the grammarian stepped out of his shadow. The concern for rhetoric by no means disappeared. The ancient speech manuals – especially the work of Cicero's youth, the *De inventione* – came to provide training in composition applicable to

all forms of literary expression. But more than this, the Middle Ages inherited, particularly from the late empire, an interest in rhetoric as a way of reasoning, and after 1000, rhetoric became a part of the study of logic.

The Carolingian Renaissance of the late eighth and early ninth centuries, directed by a ruler bent on raising the educational level of his people, represented a triumph for the grammarian. For Alcuin, the so-called schoolmaster of the empire, grammar was without a doubt the queen of the trivium: "Grammar is the science of letters and the guardian of right speech and writing."[22] For him the art embraced not merely letters, syllables, words, and parts of speech, but also figures of speech, the art of prosody, poetry, stories, and history. Although Alcuin and his contemporaries acknowledged that theology was the supreme field of study, the theologians, whose methodology required the filiation of etymologies of terms and analyses of allegories, were of necessity practitioners of grammar.

The limited number of those who knew Latin necessarily restricted the role of oratorical or public rhetoric in Carolingian society. Accounts of school curricula indicate no serious training in either speech writing or delivery. Sermons appear to have been largely repetitions of patristic homilies.[23] Admittedly, Alcuin did compose a dialogue on the art of rhetoric, *Dialogus de rhetorica et virtutibus*, eighty per cent of which derived from Cicero's *De inventione*. With Charlemagne as narrator, Alcuin presented a curious account of rhetoric, almost entirely focused on judicial oratory.[24] The extent to which Latin pleading was useful in a legal system based on custom is questionable, as is the level of priority Latin would have had even for clerics. Perhaps, although conditions fostering Latin oratory in the society were absent, Alcuin wished to cover this art of the trivium with a manual, as he had covered the other two. Lacking an orientation dictated by contemporary needs, in making his exposition he merely took over Cicero's focus on judicial oratory.[25]

---

[22] Alcuin of York, *Opusculum primum: Grammatica*, in *PL*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 101 (Paris, 1863), cols. 857d–58a.

[23] J. Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1983), 34–54, discusses Carolingian reliance on homilies constructed by piecing together texts from the Fathers. There is, however, evidence of occasional originality (H. Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre: Authenticité, inventaire, tableaux comparatifs, initia* [Vatican City, 1962]).

[24] *Rhetores latini minores*, ed. K. Halm (Leipzig, 1863), 525–50.

[25] Luitpold Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne: Studies in Carolingian History and Literature* (Ithaca, 1959), 71, interprets the motive for the work otherwise: "The *Rhetoric* is made

Although the Carolingian Renaissance lost its impetus by the middle years of the ninth century with the break-up of the Carolingian Empire, a structure of education oriented around grammar continued to dominate the schools of Europe for at least two more centuries.[26] By the late twelfth century, however, the ascendancy of grammar in northern Europe was threatened by a new passion for the study of logic. Taught for the first time in a systematic fashion by Gerbert at Rheims in the last quarter of the tenth century, the initial textbooks of logic formed what came to be known as the *logica vetus* (the old logic). It was composed of the elementary works of Aristotle's *Organon* and a small collection of commentaries and introductory manuals on logic by other ancient authors.[27] Rhetoric's independent status had already been threatened in the late ancient world, now rhetoric came to be viewed as subordinate to logic as a species to a genus.[28]

By the middle of the twelfth century, the advanced works of Aristotle's *Organon*, the *logica nova* (new logic), began to circulate, and the curriculum for teaching logic with rhetoric as an important compo-

---

up of rhetorical doctrine, not because Alcuin wanted to write a rhetorical textbook, but because Alcuin wished to describe the *mores* of Charlemagne as those that ought to serve as examples to his subjects ...."

[26] On the role of the cathedral and monastic schools in France from the ninth to the twelfth centuries, see J. Châtillon, "Les écoles de Chartres et de Saint-Victor," in *La scuola nell'Occidente latino dell' alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 19 (Spoleto, 1972), 795–839; G. Paré, A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La renaissance au XIIe siècle: Les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris and Ottawa, 1933); L. Maître, *Les écoles épiscopales et monastiques en Occident avant les universités (768–1180)*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1924); F. Lesne, *Les livres, "scriptoria" et bibliothèques du commencement du VIIIe à la fin du XIe siècles* (Lille, 1938), vol. 4 of *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique*; R.R. Bezzola, *La société féodale et la transformation de la littérature de cour: Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident (550–1200)*, pt. 2, t. 1, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences historiques et philologiques*, no. 330 (Paris, 1960), 19–45; and P. Riché, *Les écoles et l'enseignement dans l'Occident chrétien de la fin du Ve siècle au milieu du XIe siècle* (Paris, 1979), 141–47 and 179–84.

[27] R.W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, 1953), 175. As late as Anselm, however, argumentation was so closely dependent on grammar that M. Colish, "Eleventh-Century Grammar in the Thought of St. Anselm," in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Âge* (Montreal and Paris, 1969), 789, describes logic in this century as "Aristotelianized grammar." Cf. Charles M. Radding, *A World Made by Men: Cognition and Society, 400–1200* (Chapel Hill, 1985), 166–86.

[28] R. McKeon, "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 17 (1942): 15–16. Carolingian writers had occasionally treated rhetoric as a part of logic, but the new concern with logic from the late tenth century brought the nature of the relationship to the fore. McKeon, 12 and 14–15, also notes the tendency of rhetoric to be tied to theology as "the art of stating truths certified by theology" (15).

nent assumed the general form it was to take down to the nineteenth century. The newly discovered texts further intensified the passion of scholars for logic because of the promise they held for advances in scientific and theological investigation. By 1200, already on the defensive, spokesmen for the grammatical tradition were overcome by the proponents of the new philosophical and theological disciplines, who could point to exciting discoveries produced by new methodologies. Although we must avoid exaggerating the extent to which grammatical interests declined after 1200, at least we can say that the rich production of Latin letters and poetry emanating from the cathedral schools of twelfth-century France, Germany, and England came to an end. The most exciting intellectual achievements of northern Europeans in the thirteenth century were in logic, natural science, and theology.

While in France rhetoric as a form of reasoning was studied as an auxiliary to logic, in northern and central Italy the reverse was true. Throughout the five centuries following the fall of Rome, northern and central Italy continued to depend on written documents as records of important forms of human interaction and, consequently, on lay and clerical notaries, who knew how to capture legal reality in formulas. Broad strata of the general population had frequent contact with documents, and elementary Latin literacy seems to have been relatively widespread.[29] The evolution of the trivium in northern and central Italy cannot, in fact, be understood unless the culture of books is studied alongside the culture of documents.

Beginning around 1000, a conjunction of demographic, political, and economic revivals compelled notaries to turn to Roman law (codified in the Justinian corpus) in order to resolve legal issues of greater complexity and to devise new formulas to meet the needs of

[29] For some statistics on lay and clerical literacy in the eighth century in Italy, see A. Petrucci, "Libro, scritture e scuole," in *La scuola nell'Occidente latino dell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull' alto medioevo, 19 (1972): 323–25. See also G.C. Fissore, "Cultura grafica e scuola in Asti nei secoli IX e X," *Bullettino dell'Istituto italiano per il medioevo e Archivo muratoriano*, 85 (1974–75): 17–51. Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983), 41, stresses the importance of the Italian notariate in the early medieval centuries, but within his general discussion, Italian precedence in literacy plays no particular role. See the brief observations on literacy and semiliteracy in J. LeGoff, "Alle origini del lavoro intellectuale in Italia: I problemi del rapporto fra la letteratura, l'università e le professioni," *LI* 1:651–52.

a progressively more specialized urban society.[30] The Roman lawyer appeared, and with him a new book culture, but a practically oriented one. Almost always a layman, he was both a practitioner and a teacher. In the latter capacity, he studied the Justinian legal corpus, interpreted legal passages for his students, and prepared them for careers as litigators in the courts.[31]

Given the lawyers' interests, Cicero proved a more useful guide than Aristotle or Boethius. While Cicero's judicial eloquence was beyond their powers, his teaching in reasoning and oratorical tactics furnished invaluable help for constructing arguments. Cicero had had his own dialectic, but in it syllogism played a minor role, the emphasis being on inference, on a consideration of consequences, and on *a fortiori* arguments.[32] Nevertheless, Cicero thought that a syllogism could at times be a useful tool for an orator, even when arguing a practical point. At least into the thirteenth century, logic was largely taught in connection with legal studies and probably in the law classroom itself.[33]

As in their eleventh-century French counterparts, Italian cathedral schools north of Rome preserved Carolingian book culture, stressing instruction in the ancient writers, especially the poets. Nor in this century before the great flourishing of Latin letters in France did the Italians appear in any way inferior in their own poetic compositions to the French. In contrast with the French cathedral schools, however, the Italian ones had no monopoly on advanced education: whereas they controlled the teaching of ancient letters, Roman legal studies fell largely to the lay lawyer teaching in his own school.[34] In

[30] Charles Radding, *The Origins of Medieval Jurisprudence: Pavia and Bologna 850–1150* (New Haven, 1988), 37–112, details the beginning of formal legal studies at Pavia in the early eleventh century.

[31] See Witt, "Medieval Italian Culture," 39–40.

[32] On Cicero's dialectic, see A. Cantin, *Les sciences séculières et la foi: Les deux voix de la science au jugement de S. Pierre Damien (1007–1072)* (Spoleto, 1975), 383–84.

[33] In an extensive reading of Italian chancery and notarial documents from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, I have found only one reference to a dialectician, presumably a teacher. In 1140, Petrus *dialecticus* witnessed an episcopal document in Mantua (*L'Archivio capitolare della cattedrale di Mantova fino alla caduta dei Bonacolsi*, ed. Pietro Torelli [Verona, 1924], 26, doc. 18). It is revealing that the compilation of articles in *L'insegnamento della logica a Bologna nel XIV secolo*, ed. D. Buzzetti, M Ferriani, and A. Tabarroni, *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna*, n.s., 8 (Bologna, 1992), makes no reference to the history of logic at Bologna before the second half of the thirteenth century.

[34] Witt, "Medieval Italian Culture," 42–44.

the next century, moreover, when, with the composition of Gratian's *Decretum* around 1140, canon law became a subject for academic study, canon lawyers not uncommonly taught their courses independently of the cathedral.

By the end of the eleventh century, the development of a highly simplified form of letter writing known as *ars dictaminis* further enhanced the role of rhetoric in Italian education and created more competition for cathedral education. Composed in manual form, often combined with a collection of letters illustrating the principles taught in the text, *ars dictaminis*, with its simple rules, made letter writing available to large numbers of people with but a few years of training in elementary Latin. Since the teacher or *dictator* needed only a manual, *ars dictaminis* could be easily taught by independent masters.

Read aloud, letters tended to be regarded as speeches, and writers of manuals naturally looked to the rhetorical manuals attributed to Cicero for help. While authors of the medieval manuals made occasional references to the *De inventione* and the pseudo-Ciceronian *Ad Herennium*, however, the ancient textbooks had very little stylistic effect on *ars dictaminis*. Their main use in the classroom seems to have been to provide the student with training in the art of constructing logical arguments.

A major casualty in Gregory VII's program of ecclesiastical reforms was the cathedral school, that institution in which the grammatical curriculum of northern and central Italy had thrived. Within the last twenty-five years of the eleventh century, Italian cathedral chapters appear to have been riven by disputes over aspects of reform such as clerical marriage and lay investiture. Shattered by factional strife, schools disappear from the documentation of chapter life, in some cases for many decades. Although a few cathedral schools, like that at Lucca, survived in the twelfth century as centers of liberal-arts training, most others seem to have been committed to the modest task of preparing the diocesan clergy for the performance of their religious functions.[35] The withering of cathedral-school education entailed the deterioration of the traditional program of grammatical education going back to the Carolingian period.

The intellectual life of northern and central Italy in the twelfth century was largely driven by legal–rhetorical concerns and directed

[35] Ibid., 41.

by *dictatores* and Roman and canon lawyers. Only a small number of Latin poems, most of them patriotic epics, survive from this century.[36] The extent of grammar training was generally determined by the humble demands of *ars dictaminis*. In the case of the elite who went beyond *dictamen* to legal studies, training in reading and writing legal Latin formed part of many years' instruction under a lawyer's direction.

The fortunes of grammar revived after 1180, when a massive invasion of French scholarly and literary influences transformed the intellectual life of Italy north of Rome. At the height of their glory – not a hundred years later, when in decline, as is commonly thought – French grammarians and poets made their major contribution to the brilliant future of letters and scholarship in Italy.[37] After almost a century of playing an auxiliary role to rhetoric, grammatical studies required decades to revive; but the burst of Latin poetic composition in northern Italy by the middle of the thirteenth century shows their vigorous development by that time.[38]

Because the earliest surviving humanist writings are the Latin poems written by Lovato dei Lovati in 1267/68, humanism appears to have been a part of the advanced stage of the grammatical revival. Indeed, a careful reading of the poetic and prose production of northern and central Italians in the decades after the appearance of Lovato's poems indicates that humanistic classicizing remained restricted to poetry until 1315, when Mussato wrote his first historical work in prose. Given the almost fifty-year lag between poetry and prose, the origins of Italian humanism are to be sought in developments in grammar and not rhetoric. For decades while prose remained captive to medieval forms, humanists found an outlet in poetry for their desire to emulate the ancient Romans.

Those were the principal conclusions that I had reached by 1988, and until 1993 I thought of expanding my article into a comprehen-

[36] Francesco Novati, *Le origini, continuate e compiute da Angelo Monteverdi* (Milan, 1926), 647–49, vividly describes the "povertà" and "esilità artistica" of twelfth-century Italy. Much of the poetry that survives for the twelfth century is published by U. Ronca, *Cultura medioevale e poesia latina d'Italia nei secoli XI e XII*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1892). See as well the comments of Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism," 279–80, n. 47.

[37] See n. 8, above.

[38] Witt, "Medieval Italian Culture," 44–50, describes the nature of this French influence and its effect on various aspects of Italian intellectual life, including grammatical studies.

sive history of Latin culture in medieval Italy, leading into a study of the early development of Italian humanism. The project involved two volumes, the first filling out the narrative that I have sketched above from the Carolingian conquest to about 1250 and the second dealing with the evolution of humanism from 1250 to about 1420. By 1993, however, realizing that my study of humanism had an integrity of its own, and eager to publish my views, I set the larger project aside and concentrated on producing what would have been the second volume as a separate monograph.

Current scholarship on Renaissance humanism generally begins the study of the movement with Petrarch, tending to dismiss the previous seventy years of humanistic endeavors as "prehumanistic." Surprisingly, the massive reconstruction of the scholarly and literary achievements of the "prehumanists" since World War II by Roberto Weiss, Giuseppe and Guido Billanovich, and other scholars whose work appears in the key philological journal, *Italia medioevale et umanistica*, has done little to change that approach. Although those scholars have clearly shown that men like the Paduans, Lovato dei Lovati (1240/41–1309) and Albertino Mussato (1261–1329), shared scholarly and literary pursuits with Petrarch and had already made major advances in editing texts, in recovering lost ancient writings, and in developing a classicizing style, nonetheless, with the exception of Weiss, they have continued to label these ancestors of Petrarch "prehumanists."[39] Weiss alone claimed them as humanists, but, while

[39] Evidence of this tendency is found in the few references to pre-Petrarchan humanists found in *Renaissance Humanism*, an extensive survey of recent scholarship on the European Renaissance largely by American specialists. Examples of the tendency are found in Benjamin Kohl, "Humanism and Education," 3:7; Danilo Aguzzi-Barbagli, "Humanism and Poetics," 3:86; and John Monfasani, "Humanism and Rhetoric," 3:176. Monfasani sets the phrase "prehumanistic stage" in parentheses when speaking of pre-Petrarchan humanism as if referring to a commonly understood term, not necessarily reflecting his own terminological preferences. General treatments of humanism vary. On the one hand, Donald R. Kelley's otherwise excellent *Renaissance Humanism* (Boston, 1991) begins the history of humanism with Petrarch, while, on the other, Charles Nauert's *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge, 1995) treats both Lovato and Mussato as "prehumanists."

Italian scholars are prone to use the same terminology for humanism prior to Petrarch. Perhaps the best illustration of the practice is found in *SCV* 2, in which early humanism in the cities of the Veneto is consistently labelled "prehumanistic." Guido Billanovich, who has done more than any other researcher to enhance Lovato's scholarly reputation, himself uses the term "prehumanistic" in characterizing early Paduan humanism in his important "Il preumanesimo padovano," *SCV* 2:19–110. He does not, however, define the term.

drawing on the results of his research, most contemporary scholarship tends to ignore his conclusion.[40] Moreover, Weiss did not see that his position required a reassessment of Petrarch's role in the movement. One of the questions I hope to answer is this: What role does Petrarch play in the history of humanism as a third-generation humanist?

Oddly, the term "prehumanist" has almost never been defined by those who employ it, and when it has, the justification for using it seems strained. Perhaps the most extensive definition I have found is that given by Natalino Sapegno in 1960. In introducing a short section devoted to the Paduans, Lovato and Mussato, in his *Il Trecento*, he writes:

> It will not be out of place here to remember the prehumanists, the first fathers of that great cultural movement of which Boccaccio and Petrarch become its masters .... The prehumanists move in a still uncertain atmosphere; they advance as if unaware of their new attitude, even if some of them find themselves engaged in the first polemics against the defenders of antiquity.[41]

Although these "prehumanists" are the first to engage in the defense of reading the ancient poets, nonetheless, they are unconscious of doing anything new.

> In them much more than in Petrarch and Boccaccio, one still sees the tie that attaches them to medieval civilization. They do not oppose it as much as advance a tendency, an impulse which, earlier left in shadow and now brought into the light and rendered substantial, will only

[40] He did this specifically in *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy* (London, 1947); rpt. 1970). He provocatively entitled his essays devoted to various pre-Petrarcan humanists *Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo: Studi e testi*, Storia e letteratura, 27 (Rome, 1949). Although Kristeller deals only cursorily in his writings with the earlier humanists, he basically endorses the position that I would characterize as that of the "philologists": "Petrarcas Stellung in der Geschichte der Gelehrsamkeit," 102: "Ich ziehe es mit Roberto Weiss und anderen vor, sie als Humanisten gelten zu lassen, und Petrarca nicht als den ersten Humanisten anzusehen, sondern als den ersten grossen Humanisten ...." In his important survey of Renaissance and Reformation European intellectual life, Donald Wilcox, *In Search of God and Self: Renaissance and Reformation Thought* (Boston, 1975), 59, recognizes the role of scholars of Mussato's generation in initiating the humanist movement, but he does not mention Lovato.

[41] *Il Trecento* (Milan, 1960), 151–52. The Italian text reads: "... non parrà strano ricordar qui i preumanisti, i primi padri di quel grande movimento di cultura, che nel Boccaccio stesso e nel Petrarca riconoscerà più tardi i suoi maestri. ... i preumanisti procedono in un'atmosfera ancora incerta, avanzano quasi inconsapevoli della novità del loro atteggiamento, per quanto si ritrovino, alcuni di essi, a dover sostenere le prime polemiche contro i difensori dell'antico."

> slowly reveal its renovating power, its function as the yeast for modern civilization. In them in a more apparent and open way, the scholar sees the slow progress by which from grammatical studies, which had been the continuous patrimony of notaries, judges, and lawyers in preceding centuries, the appreciation of a greater and wiser culture slowly arose. That appreciation had to be revived in human souls through the painstaking conquest of its language and its art.[42]

The "prehumanists" are more "medieval" than Petrarch or Boccaccio because, although they all build on the same medieval grammatical studies, they are chronologically prior and correspondingly less appreciative of "a greater and wiser culture."

At this point Sapegno expands the ranks of prehumanists to include all those with grammatical interests over the previous two hundred years: "Grammarians, teachers, notaries, jurists are indeed all representatives of prehumanism."[43] The term as a category loses any serious meaning. But, now, as if to reclaim the term specifically for Paduans, Sapegno concludes:

> And there is still, so to speak, something professional in their love of ancient poetry which is not found in Petrarch or Boccaccio. Nevertheless, this love is already alive and conscious in them. They have already recognized the profound separation between present civilization and the monumental one of Rome. It is this new animus which is really important in their work, beyond the external appearance, and even if the writings in which they tried to reproduce the spirits and forms of the great classical age remain for the most part quite distant from the great ideal of poetry to which they aspire, or rather, to speak more accurately, from any manner of poetry at all.[44]

---

[42] The passage continues: "In essi, assai più che nel Petrarca e nel Boccaccio, è visibile ancora il legame che li tiene attaccati alla civiltà medievale; alla quale non tanto si contrappongono, quanto piuttosto ne continuano una tendenza, un impulso altra volta rimasto in ombra, e che ora recato in piena luce e divenuto essenziale solo a poco a poco rivelerà la sua virtù rinnovatrice, la sua funzione di lievito nella moderna civiltà. In essi è meglio appariscente e si rivela più schietto allo studioso il lento processo per cui dagli studi grammaticali, che pur nei secoli precedenti eran stati patrimonio continuato dei maestri, dei notai, dei giudici, dei legisti, sorge a poco a poco la coscienza di una civiltà più grande e più saggia, che si deve far risorgere negli animi attraverso la conquista faticosa della sua lingua e della sua arte."

[43] "Grammatici e maestri, notai o giuristi sono appunto tutti i rappresentanti del preumanesimo."

[44] "E qualcosa, a dir così, di 'professionale' è ancora nel loro amore della poesia antica, mentre non è già più in quello del Boccaccio e del Petrarca. Pur tuttavia questo amore è già in essi assai vivo e cosciente, e raggiunta ormai la consapevolezza del distacco profondo tra la civiltà presente e quella grandissima di Roma. E questo "animus" nuovo è quello che veramente importa nella loro opera, al di là dell' apparenza esteriore, e anche se gli scritti nei quali essi si sforzarono di riprodurre gli

Apart from the unexplained qualification of their poetry containing "something professional," Sapegno now seems bent on ascribing to the Paduans self-conscious humanist attitudes.

If all that those who employ the term "prehumanist" mean is that these men were predecessors of Petrarch, then I have no quarrel with them. The chronological priority of the Paduans is indisputable. Ignoring their status as humanists by beginning the movement with Petrarch, however, distorts both their role and that of Petrarch himself. Only when the latter is seen as a third-generation humanist can his enormous contribution to humanism – indeed, his single-handed rerouting of the movement – be appreciated. Against the backdrop of this new interpretation of Trecento humanism, Quattrocento civic humanism will assume a new aspect as well.

I have endeavored in the early chapters of this book to combine the results of contemporary research on early Latin humanism with that of literary scholars on vernacular literature. Although Italian researchers commonly work in both fields, the traditions of the two have tended to militate against the formation of a composite picture of the Latin and vernacular cultures of late Duecento and early Trecento Italy. It was not a coincidence that Brunetto Latini undertook his first Tuscan translation of Cicero's works and that Lovato wrote his first Latin poetry in the 1260s. Their work reflected different responses to a similar, deeply felt need on the part of Italian intellectuals for closer ties with their ancient Roman inheritance. A brief analysis of the interplay between Tuscan vernacular and humanist writings in the century from 1250 to 1350 will serve to illuminate both linguistic traditions.[45]

I should say parenthetically that my analysis is limited to the portion of Italy north of Rome. Largely independent of the Carolingian empire, the south developed in the Middle Ages in a different way from the northern half of the peninsula, and generalizations made about northern and central Italian intellectual and cultural life usually do not fit conditions in the south.

In what follows, I have chosen to place more emphasis than is

---

spiriti e le forme della grande età classica rimangono per lo più assai lontani da quell'ideale di poesia, cui essi aspirano, lontani anzi, a dir meglio, da una maniera qualsiasi di poesia."

[45] I suggest that the parallel relationship in the development of Latin and vernacular literature after Petrarch and down to the second half of the fifteenth century is reflected in their common focus on prose writing to the neglect of poetry.

usual in accounts of humanism on changes in Latin prose style as prime gauges of the evolution of the movement from Lovato's to Bruni's generation. In choosing to do so, I am taking up where Trecento and Quattrocento humanists themselves left off. When authors from Salutati to Sabellico wrote the history of the movement, they largely focused on the progressive mastery of ancient Latin style from one generation to another. In my own account, however, I have no intention of ignoring the multidimensional character of humanistic activity, especially the increasing sophistication of humanists' historical and philological research, together with their ethical and religious concerns – those aspects of humanism that occupy most of the attention of current scholarship.

My decision to center my discussion of humanism on stylistic change derives not from an antiquarian loyalty to the earliest approaches, but rather from my conviction that a litmus for identifying a humanist was his intention to imitate ancient Latin style. At the least, a dedication to stylistic imitation initiated the destabilization of an author's own linguistic universe through his contact with that of antiquity. As a consequence, I do not regard as humanists those contemporaries who were engaged in historical and philological research on ancient culture but who showed no sign of seeking to emulate ancient style, but rather I consider them antiquarians.

When a humanist set out to imitate ancient style, he confronted ancient models that evoked in him certain sympathies and antipathies. The experience of confrontation served, on the one hand, to locate the pagan texts at a remote distance in the past, and, on the other, to render the mentality of the ancients to some degree accessible to the imitators. The push and pull between the experience of the text as simultaneously both remote and familiar resulted in a progressive reconstruction of antiquity as a "cultural alternative," bringing into relief the character of the humanists' own world and revealing the historically contingent nature of both societies.[46] Imposed upon the past, the resultant historicizing of experience, while enhancing the imitability of the pagan writers by making them more human, also problematized their authority for the same reason. Projected

[46] The phrase "cultural alternative" is borrowed from Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven and London, 1982), 90.

forward, historical perspective pointed to a future replete with possibilities and encouraged human efforts at reform.[47]

The early humanists' desire to imitate the ancients also effected intellectual and attitudinal changes in the humanists themselves. Concerned with the transformative influence of the direct encounter with the ancients, Kenneth Gouwens has highlighted the importance of the dialogue with antiquity in the construction of a new sense of historical perspective as well as a new kind of self-awareness. He has also noted in a general way the effects that imitation of ancient "concepts, styles, categories, and vocabularies" had on the humanists' cognitive processes.[48] In this work, I intend to develop the latter observation by showing in detail how the humanists' tireless study of ancient vocabulary and syntax and their struggle to capture the eloquent diction of the classical authors not only unlocked the mentality of those authors, but also nourished new linguistic patterns conditioning the humanists' ways of feeling and thinking.[49] No humanist demonstrated an awareness of the pervasive influence of imitation on his thought processes better than Francesco Petrarch, who, after years of studying the pagan writers intensely, described his relationship to them in this way:

---

[47] Gouwens, "Perceiving the Past," 76–77, speaks of the relation of the humanists with the past as "dialogic" and stresses the importance of this relationship for the humanists' personal growth. In doing so, he draws on the insights of Jerome Brunner, *The Culture of Education* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1996), 62: "... there is something special about 'talking' to authors, now dead but still alive in their ancient texts – so long as the objective of the encounter is not worship but discourse and interpretation, 'going meta' on thoughts about the past."

[48] Gouwens, "Perceiving the Past," 64 and 67. Gouwens is also anxious to recognize "a more comprehensive re-creation of ancient culture" on the part of the humanists in that they incorporated ancient culture into their daily lives. For this purpose he specifically discusses the role of ancient culture in the recreational activity of Roman humanists around 1500. For a general bibliography on cognitive psychology, see Gouwens, 55–56.

[49] The influence of Michael Baxandall's *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition* (Oxford, 1971) on my thesis that style exercised a formative influence on humanist thinking will be obvious throughout this book. His view that the imitation of ancient Latin style effected a "reorganization of consciousness" in the humanists (6) strikes me, however, as leaning too much toward linguistic determinism. The theory that grammatical models fully determine the formulation and expression of human thought is better known as the Whorf–Sapir hypothesis. See the classic article, "Language, Thought, and Reality," in *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, ed. John B. Carroll (Cambridge, 1973), 246–70.

> They have become absorbed into my being and implanted not only in my memory but in the marrow of my bones and have become one with my mind so that even if I never read them [Virgil, Horace, Boethius, and Cicero] again in my life, they would inhere in me with their roots sunk in the depths of my soul.[50]

Stylistic demands never exerted a pre-emptive influence on thought processes.[51] A notable difference existed in this regard, however, before and after 1400. In the earlier years, when humanists consciously avoided imitating any one ancient author, they borrowed idiosyncratically from a wide variety of pagan and Christian authors down at least to Augustine, with the result that the cognitive impact was modified by the fragmentary character of the imitative process. After 1400, however, the focus on Cicero's style significantly limited a writer's options. Although humanists in the early fifteenth century did not depend slavishly on the Ciceronian model, nonetheless, their enshrining of Cicero as the basic model for eloquent prose meant that writers were forced into constant one-to-one negotiation with his linguistic constructions and lexicon. Years of training oneself to filter ideas through a Ciceronian linguistic grid would ultimately effect how the humanists' thought and felt.

In their negotiations with the ancients, the first five generations of humanists reveal what may be called an "anxiety of influence."[52] While humanists all sought originality in their literary work and, beginning with Petrarch, held that style was a key reflection of personality, they also nonetheless felt driven to bolster their own authority as writers by using a classicizing style and citing ancient authors frequently.

In practice, the process of conscious selection that the humanists developed as they bargained with antiquity had real limits. Those limits were set by a variety of factors, including the allurement that ancient Latin diction exerted and the impossibility of identifying all the ingredients in the model that were to be brought over in the act

---

[50] Petrarch, *Rerum familiarium* XXII.2, in *Familiari* 4:106: "Hec se michi tam familiariter ingessere et non modo memorie sed medulis affixa sunt unumque cum ingenio facta sunt meo. ut etsi per omnem vitam amplius non legantur, ipsa quidem hereant, actis in intima animi parte radicibus." Translation mine.

[51] Conceptual and linguistic systems are not monolithic; alternatives are possible *within* the systems. See, George Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind* (Chicago and London, 1990), 335, for bibliography.

[52] The phrase is Harold Bloom's: see his *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1997).

of imitation. With classical modes of expression "sunk," to paraphrase Petrarch, "in the depths of their soul," ways of formulating thought became ways of thinking. To attribute such a creative, constructive role to style is to recognize its potential for illuminating every other aspect of humanist activity.[53]

Stylistic imitation in poetry and prose took a variety of forms. [54]

(1) *Imitation of genre.* The advent of humanism can be traced to the late 1260s, when the first Latin lyrical poetry was written in Italy since antiquity. Early in the Trecento, pastoral poetry reappeared, and the ancient conception of the private letter revived. For centuries, the manuals of *ars dictaminis* had not distinguished the private letter from the official letter in form or tone. By the end of the fourteenth century, humanists began to reconceive oration along lines set out in the *Ad Herennium* and *De inventione.*

(2) *Imitation of technique.* Medieval grammarians and rhetoricians read the same ancient manuals of rhetoric and exploited the same ancient arsenal of *colores rhetorici* as the humanists did. Medieval writers, however, often employed rhetorical colors to an extreme degree, whereas the early humanists, controlling their use of *colores*, more nearly approached ancient practice. They revived the simile, which had been neglected by medieval poets, and, by the 1360s, following the *Ad Herennium*, they introduced *ekphrasis* (description) in their orations. Trecento prose writers differed in their approach to the medi-

[53] Strikingly, all the current interest in rhetoric as a way of thought and method of argumentation has done little to alter scorn for stylistic matters. Many scholars seem unable to overcome the prejudice that *elocutio* is merely ornamental.

[54] On the concept of *mimesis* as an artistic imitation of reality. see Richard McKeon, "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity," *Modern Philology* 34 (1936): 1–35, and rpt. in *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern*, ed. R.S. Crane (Chicago, 1952), 117–45; Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: the Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton, 1953); Hermann Koller, *Die Mimesis in der Antike: Nachahmung, Darstellung, Ausdruck* (Berne, 1954); *Mimesis: From Mirror to Method: Augustine to Descartes*, ed. John D. Lyons and Stephen G. Nichols (Hanover, N.H., 1982); and Ann Vasaly, *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley, 1993). For *mimesis* as a technique of literary creativity, see the summary article by Wilhelm Kroll, "Rhetorik," *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. 7 (Stuttgart, 1940), cols. 1113–17; and his *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924), 14–78. General discussions of creative imitation in the Renaissance are found in Hermann Gmelin, "Das Prinzip der *Imitatio* in den romanischen Literaturen der Renaissance," *Romanische Forschungen* 46 (1932): 83–360; and Greene, *The Light in Troy*. For difficulties in detecting imitation, see Johannes Schneider, *Die Vita Heinrici IV und Sallust: Studien zu Stil und Imitatio in der mittellateinischen Prosa*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, 49 (Berlin, 1965), 6–14.

eval *cursus*, that is the rules for using accentual meter to lend rhythm to the lines. While most humanist prose writers in the Trecento ceased to use it in other genres of composition, humanists throughout the century generally continued to observe the *cursus* in letter writing. Even Bruni in the early Quattrocento could not break entirely with the medieval tradition of writing in *cursus*.

(3) *Imitation of style.*[55]

a. *Sacramental imitation.* This form of imitation, involving the literal citation of the ancient text in the humanist's composition, constituted a minimal gesture in the direction of the model. In this case, the ancient original was merely appropriated as a sacred utterance, formally perfect and free of historical contingency because untranslatable in any other words. To the extent that an author treated the subtext liturgically, he short-circuited the potential reciprocity inherent in stylistic imitation, by ignoring the contingent character of the subtext in favor of affirming its status as an eternal exemplar.

b. *Exploitative (reproductive) imitation.* Common to all humanist poetry, this approach to imitation involved employing a variety of ancient sources in the form of echoes, images, or phrases in the poem's fabric. Against the complex pagan matrix, the new poem defined its own identity while admitting or rather proclaiming its loyalty to its antecedents. Having grasped the contingent and malleable character of his subtexts, the humanist poet demonstrated his mastery by evoking associations with the ancient works while establishing his own voice.

c. *Heuristic imitation.* In this form of imitation, the author established a reciprocal relationship between his composition and a single parallel text or a succession of texts. Because the resulting dialogue

[55] Greene, *Light in Troy*, 38–45, provides a brilliant analysis of Petrarch's Latin and vernacular poetry based on a hierarchy of categories arranged so as to emphasize progressively the intimate presence of the ancient subtext in the humanist's composition and the degrees of reciprocity between the two texts. He suggests four levels of imitation – sacramental, exploitative (reproductive), heuristic, and dialectical – the last of which I have not found in the early humanists. Dialectical imitation occurs most commonly in parodic compositions, where mood, tone, and intention may be diametrically opposed to those of the original text. Thus, the work asserts maximum independence for itself while insisting on its indebtedness to the ancient model. The fortune of this mode of interpretation lay in the future, with such writers as Erasmus and Scarron. The first three forms of stylistic imitation are taken from Greene.

was simplified by the sustained presence of only two voices (although the relationship might occasionally be interrupted by momentary echoes of others), the reader, aware of the subtext, took delight in a familiar presence. Through heuristic imitation, the humanist author underlined the originality of his own composition in contradistinction to the ancient model. Imitation highlighted the temporal distance between the humanist's work and the model. Each was seen as an historically contingent human creation.

d. *Generic imitation.* While successful heuristic imitation was a sure way of acquiring the aura of antiquity that humanist writers sought, it is important to stress that such imitation occurred infrequently in poetry and rarely in prose. By contrast, the other two kinds of imitation, sacral and reproductive, which were preferred by the early humanists in both prose and verse, were also favored by medieval writers, who seldom achieved a classicizing effect. Instead, classicizing in humanist compositions, while deriving in part from literal citation and echoes of a variety of ancient texts, rested primarily on rhythm or meter, word choice, syntax, disciplined use of figures, and, in the case of prose, sentence structure.[56] Imitation of such elements provided the formal context that lent classical color to allusions and provided congenial settings for direct citations of ancient authors. Because such imitation rarely took as subtext a single "original" or a succession of them, even when a specific author was acting as a model, I have called this variety of imitation "generic." While not establishing the kind of stylistic intimacy between author and ancient model afforded the successful heuristic imitation, the generic imitator had still to situate himself in relation to a pagan author or authors if he intended to invoke an ancient presence in what he wrote. In the following analysis, most cases of imitation that we shall consider, whether successful or less so, represent efforts to capture the generic

[56] Morris Croll, *Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll*, ed. M. Patrick, R. Evans, with H. M. Wallace and R.J. Schoeck (Princeton, 1966), 3–233, representing discussions on Attic and Asian prose among ancient Latin writers and their seventeenth-century descendants, emphasizes the formal aspects distinguishing the two styles. In one of the *loci classici* of ancient Latin stylistic analyses (*Epist. ad Lucillum*, 84), Seneca discussed contemporary stylistic practices on the basis of lexicon, metaphorical usage, and sentence arrangement, together with the consequences for rhythm and clarity.

classicizing effect that Poggio Bracciolini referred to as *vetustas*, by which he meant "the flavor of antiquity."[57]

I have used the term "classicizing" throughout the book to avoid having to discuss whether Renaissance authors themselves really wrote "classical" Latin. Modern classicists tend to identify as "classical" the elite political and literary language of a few writers belonging to the first century B.C.E. and the first and second centuries C.E. Pride of place is often assigned to Cicero, whose elaborate periodic sentences are conventionally acknowledged to display a craftsmanship seldom rivaled. Here I have accepted the standard notion of what constitutes classicism, complete with its tacit and not-so-tacit aesthetic judgments. I have not done so, however, simply from a desire to adhere to the received wisdom among today's appreciators of Latinity. Instead, I have tried to follow the standards of fifteenth-century humanists themselves, standards that emerged as humanism developed and that, once established, were passed down to today's classicists largely unchanged.

The current project has occupied me in one way or another for the past twenty years. I have proceeded by endeavoring to immerse myself in the written culture produced in northern and central Italy from the twelfth through the fifteenth century. It was a world that to begin with had no single, dominant language of literary composition and no single set of literary standards. Nor was there one Latin: different genres of composition followed different rules. By the late fifteenth century, however, thanks to the humanists, a set of standards for Latin composition had emerged; across genres, classicizing was now the norm. In the fourteenth century, humanism had been a scholarly, literary movement that involved a few members of lay

[57] Although Poggio's letter is lost, Salutati's response, defending the quality of Petrarch's Latin against the younger man's attacks, makes it clear that Poggio invoked *vetustas* or, as I understand the word, "the flavor of antiquity," as a general term encompassing his aesthetic ideal of Latin style: Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:131 and 134. Mussato had used the term earlier in the same sense. In his dedication of the *Historia augusta* to Henry VII, Mussato writes that he hesitated for a long time before daring to compose his history "dum plurimum decertasset cum ratione voluntas. Ratio siquidem et tui sublimitatem, et rerum magnitudinem contemplabatur, quibus aequanda fuerat verborum, sermonumque vetustas": *RIS* 10, col. 9.

I have not found the word used in antiquity in connection with style. The many ancient associations of *vetustas* with wine, however, may have inspired the usage: cf. Cic., *Sen.*, 18.65; Cato, *R.R.*, 114.2; and Columella, 3.2.19–20. The word will be used in Poggio's sense in the following chapters.

professions. In the fifteenth, it became the foundation for the educational program of the Italian upper classes.

It so happens that I think that classicized Latin is good Latin, and I have made no concerted effort in the book to conceal that fact. My historical argument, however, does not depend on my aesthetic allegiances. I would certainly be the last to deny that my sense of what constitutes good Latin is historically contingent. Indeed, this study has made me more aware than I was before of the historical connections between the values, not just of today's classicists, but today's academics in general and the values of our humanist forebears. I do not deny that innumerable writers of medieval Latin may have wielded a language that admirably served their own cultural goals. Their goals, however, are not ours, whereas the humanists', in important ways, are.

We also share values. Like the humanists, for example, we regard issues of individual and societal reform as urgent, favor secular over supernatural arguments, and take a critical stance toward the authorities whom we cite. Historians in particular share with the humanists an awareness of historical contingency and of humans' multifaceted experience of historical time. Even postmodern scholars seeking to liberate themselves from Enlightenment (and Renaissance) paradigms are carrying forward, in a radical way, a project that began anew with the humanists: being skeptical about texts.

Part of what makes the study of the humanists exciting is our complicity with them: in significant ways, we – and here I do not mean people of European extraction but rather every academic in any university anywhere – are their inheritors. That studying our own forebears presents theoretical challenges is something that I do not deny, but I am neither inclined to indulge in lengthy theorizing nor professionally trained to do so. Instead, I have relied on close reading and thick description to construct what all readers, I trust, will acknowledge is a complex picture. The development of humanism is not a simple, linear process like climbing up a ladder. I envision it, rather, as the gradual development of a language game, a kind of aesthetic exercise among a few literati to begin with that in time became a broad-based movement with high aspirations and sweeping consequences.[58] If the Renaissance rediscovered the classi-

[58] Although speaking of "political" languages, J.G.A. Pocock, "The Concept of a Language and the *Métier d'Historien*: Some Considerations on Practice," in his *Politics,*

cal world and sought to emulate it, the fuse that set off the process of rediscovery and emulation was humanism.

While it would have been possible for me, in keeping with academic practice, to enhance my credibility among academics by assuming a posture of greater distance from my subject and pretending not to take sides, I have chosen to make my allegiances clear. To hide them would only have been to deepen my complicity, since the posture of self-distancing, too, is an aspect of our academic manners that we take from the humanists.

Dealing as I have with the origins of the movement, I feel justified in ending my account with the first decades of the fifteenth century. Considered from the standpoint of stylistic change, whereas Lovato's first poetry marked the beginning of the movement, another phase in the history of humanism, oratorical humanism, more precisely designated as "the first Ciceronianism," began immediately after 1400. Because of the far-reaching consequences of the new aesthetic goals pursued by the generation of humanists coming to maturity in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, we may confidently affirm that the period of early humanism had by then concluded. The study closes with a brief survey of the work of the fifth generation.

Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History (New York, 1971), 21, provides a definition that applies here. He defines languages as "ways of talking ..., distinguishable language games of which each may have its own vocabulary, rules, preconditions and implications, tone and style."

CHAPTER TWO

THE BIRTH OF THE NEW AESTHETIC

The renewed interest in Latin grammar and literature by 1190, after a century of neglect, could not by itself have led to the birth of Italian humanism.[1] Nonetheless, the early Italian humanists would not have

[1] I deal extensively with the decades following the struggle over investiture in my *The Two Cultures of Medieval Italy, 800–1250* (forthcoming). See also my brief characterization of the period in my "Medieval Italian Culture and the Origins of Humanism as a Stylistic Ideal," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1988), 1:42.

Because commentaries on ancient authors were intimately connected with the formal teaching of their work, the popularity of a particular author can be gauged by the number of surviving commentaries and *accessus* to his work. B. Munk Olsen, *L'Etude des auteurs classiques latins aux IXe et XIIe siècles*, 3 vols. in 4 (Paris, 1982–89), devotes the first two volumes of his study to an inventory of Latin manuscripts of most of the literary writings of ancient Latin authors, along with commentaries and *accessus* to their work, copied in various areas of western Europe between 800 and 1200 and currently found in European and American libraries.

I will deal with this catalogue in more detail in my forthcoming work on medieval Italy, but for the present it is important to say that in the statistics that I give below, I have condensed to four the geographical areas that Munk Olsen assigns for the origin of the manuscripts: Italy, France, Germany, and England. I include in the geographical area "Germany" all manuscripts originating in Germany, Austria, or Switzerland. Those manuscripts whose origin is given as northern or southern France are comprised under "France." Because of the complexity of the Low Countries, manuscripts designated as from "Belgium" or "the Low Counties" have been omitted. I have arbitrarily assigned manuscripts credited to Lorraine to "France" and those to Alsace to "Germany." "Italy" includes all manuscripts listed by Munk Olsen as originating in Italy. Although Munk Olsen marks many manuscripts as of unknown origin, if he suggests a single area as a possible location for a manuscript, I assign it to that area. If, however, he indicates that alternative origins are possible, I have omitted the manuscript from my calculations.

Where possible, Munk Olsen uses abbreviations to indicate more specifically the period when a manuscript was copied, within the four centuries covered by his inventory. His terminology for the twelfth century reads as follows: xii in [beginning], xii 1 [first half], xii m [middle], xii [within the century], xii 2/4 [second half], xii/xiii [either late xii or early xiii], and finally xii/xiii xiii [leaving open the possibility that the manuscript was copied after the first decades of the thirteenth century]. Because the last designation suggests the possibility that the manuscript was copied well into the thirteenth century, I do not consider manuscripts belonging to that category in the statistics below. Scholars working in particular areas may quarrel with dating of hands, places of origin, and with the incomplete nature of the inventory in general. Nonetheless, the statistics are suggestive.

Those for commentaries and *accessus* written for major ancient writers (Virgil,

developed their new aesthetic or incorporated it into their own writings had they been unable to draw upon the accumulated learning that was the product of six or seven decades of increasing attention to grammar and literature.

For most of the twelfth century in northern and central Italy, the study of grammar had been largely an ancillary discipline aimed at preparing students for writing letters and legal documents. In the last decade of the century, however, grammar emerged as a discipline with its own integrity. A wealth of new grammar textbooks appeared, produced by Italians for students at all levels of proficiency in the study of Latin. Although some of the textbooks, like that of Bene of Florence (d. 1240?), followed the new scientific French approach, which used examples created by the author expressly for illustrating the rules, others instead offered a rich selection of citations from ancient authors.[2] Bene's treatises on *ars dictaminis*, that is, his rhetori-

---

Lucan, Statius, Ovid, Terence, Juvenal, Cicero, Horace, and Sallust) are as follows:

	Italy	France	Germany	England
1100–1150	2	3	15	2
1150–early 13th	1	45	31	0

The three Italian manuscripts are Oxford, Bodleian, *Canon. Cl. lat.* 201-1 (xii) (on *De inv.*): ibid., 1:326–27 (Commentary 26 [which Munk Olsen abbreviates "Cc. 26"]); Montpellier, Faculté de médecine, 426–1 (xii) (on Horace): ibid., 1:516 (Cc. 11); and Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, *Lat.* 4. 219-I (xii/xiii): ibid., 2:798 (Cc. 5). To these should be added Pierpont Morgan Library 404, a manuscript of the twelfth century containing numerous glosses on Horace's poetry: ibid., 1:473 (Cc. 124).

Apart from their relevance for determining the relative status of classical authors in the school curricula of different areas of northern Europe over the twelfth century, the figures indicate that the soaring interest in ancient authors in the twelfth century in France was not matched in Italy.

[2] To French scholars like William of Conches (fl. 1154) and his disciple Peter Helias (fl. 1130–66), Priscian's failure to go beyond laying down the rules of proper usage was a decided shortcoming of his book: R.W. Hunt, "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," in his *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, ed. G.L. Bursill-Hall (Amsterdam, 1980), 18–21. Arguing for a grammar that explained why the rules functioned as they did, both William and Peter focused attention on using "discovery procedures" (*causae inventionis*) to understand the origin of word classes and their accidents (the English translation of the terms here is taken from G.L. Bursill-Hall, "The Middle Ages," *Historiography of Linguistics*, Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 13 [The Hague and Paris, 1975], 203).

The grammar treatise of Bene is summarized by C. Marchesi, "Due grammatici del medio evo," *Bullettino della Società filologica romana* 12 (1910): 24–27. Gian Carlo Alessio, "L'allegoria nei trattati di grammatica e di retorica," in *Dante e le forme dell'allegoresi*, ed. M. Picone (Ravenna, 1987), 27, refers to a late twelfth-century grammar found in Bibl. Feliniana, Lucca, 614, which represents a compilation of recent French grammatical material. Paolo of Camaldoli's *Liber tam de Prisciano quam*

cal writings, which included frequent quotations from and allusions to pagan literature, suggest that, despite the abstract quality of his own grammar book, his students, too, received at least some sampling of classical learning.[3] Even Boncompagno (d. 1240), who felt threatened by comparisons with Cicero and decried what he saw as a trend to subordinate rhetoric to grammar, manifested a knowledge of ancient literature greater than that of any northern or central Italian since Anselm of Bezate in the eleventh century.[4]

---

de Donato and the short grammar, *Summa grammatice*, which often precedes Uggucione da Pisa's encyclopedic *Magnae derivationes*, finished about 1192, may, however, antedate both these works. For Paulo's work, see G.M. Boutroix, "The *Liber tam de Prisciano quam de Donato a fratre Paulo Camaldulense monacho compositus*: First Edition with Commentary," Ph.D. Diss., Ottawa, 1971. Little is known of Paolo except that he flourished in the last three decades of the twelfth century: Vito Sivo, "Le *Introductiones dictandi* di Paolo camaldolense (Testo inedito del sec. XII ex)," *Studi e ricerche dell' Istituto del latino*, 3 (1980): 72. Gaetano Catalano, "Contributo alla biografia di Uguccio da Pisa," *Diritto ecclesiastico* 65 (1954): 11, considers Uguccione's authorship of the *Summa grammatice* highly doubtful. For the dating of the *Magnae derivationes*, see Claus Riessner, *Die Magnae Derivationes des Uguccione da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie* (Rome, 1965), 6–7.

While the French tended to concoct model sentences, Maestro Manfredo di Belmonte cited ancient sources in his early-thirteeth-century grammar: see the description of the treatise in Giuseppe Capello, "Maestro Manfredo e Maestro Sion, grammatici vercellesi del Duecento," *Aevum* 17 (1943): 55–61. Maestro Sion also cited ancient sources in his *Doctrinale novum*, composed about 1290 found in Biblioteca Capitolare Novara, 129. The contents of the *Doctrinale novum* are described by Capello, "Maestro Manfredo e Maestro Sion," 61–70. Similarly, Giovanni Balbi (d. 1298) uses frequent citations from classical sources as illustrations of grammatical rules in his *Catholicon*. For manuscripts of this work, see Aristide Marigo, *I codici manoscritti delle "Derivationes" di Uguccione pisano* (Rome, 1936), 31–40. On Balbi, see below, n. 103.

[3] *Bene Florentini Candelabrum*, ed. Gian Carlo Alessio, Thesaurus mundi: Biblioteca scriptorum latinorum mediae et recentioris aetatis, no. 2 (Padua, 1983).

[4] Helene Wieruszowski, "Rhetoric and the Classics in Italian Education," in her *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy*, Storia e letteratura, no. 121 (Rome, 1971), 598–99, provides examples of Boncompagno's knowledge of ancient literature. In the 1190s, Boncompagno depicted Bolognese *dictatores* as divided between "grammarians," who taught an elaborate style of *ars dictaminis*, using complicated sentence structure and exotic vocabulary with classical allusions, and "orators," captained by Boncompagno himself, who strove to join eloquence to simplicity. See my "Boncompagno and the Defense of Rhetoric," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986): 8–13. For Boncompagno's rivalry with Cicero, see ibid., 17–19.

Wieruszowski's now classic article, first published in 1967 (*Studi gratiana* 11 [1967]), was designed to prove, against Louis Paetow's *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric* (Urbana and Champagne, 1910), that the study of the ancient authors in Italy *remained* intense in the thirteenth century. She intended her work to parallel for Italy what E.K. Rand's "The Classics in the Thirteenth Century," *Speculum* 4 (1929): 249–69, had shown for northern Europe. She

The Roman lawyers were perhaps the best weathervanes of change. Only a few references to classical literature can be found in the work of Bolognese Roman lawyers prior to Placentinus (d. 1192). Beginning with him, the references increase.[5] Perhaps Placentinus's

---

was aware that Henry O. Taylor had already expressed doubts about the continuity of the study of pagan authors between the eleventh and twelfth centuries (Wieruszowski, "Rhetoric and the Classics," 592, n. 1), but her construction of the problem required that such continuity prevail. As for her thirteenth-century evidence, she did not make the key distinctions between northern and southern Italy, nor between the first and second half of the century.

Current scholarship largely assumes, as did Wieruszowski, that ancient literary texts figured prominently in Italian grammar-school education thoughtout the Middle Ages. There are significant exceptions. Eugenio Garin, basing his position on the complaints of fifteenth-century Italian humanists against the continued use of the standard didactic texts in the classroom, maintains that a major change in reading material occurred in the fifteenth-century grammar classroom with the substitution of reading from ancient authors: *L'educazione in Europa (1400–1600): Problemi e programmi* (Bari, 1957), 13–21. Garin's observation remains general, however, and only serves as the starting point for his study of education in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe.

In his comprehensive survey of pre-university education in Renaissance Italy, Paul Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600* (Ithaca and London, 1989), 111, writes: "Neither the 'Renaissance of the twelfth century,' a northern phenomenon, nor 'pre-humanism' or 'proto-humanism' prevalent in northern Italian legal circles around 1300 had any discernible impact on Italian schooling, especially pre-university education. Instead, fourteenth-century Italian schoolchildren followed a normative medieval curriculum that consisted of reading medieval authors and a few ancient poetic classics (or portions of them) and learning to write formal letters according to the principles of *ars dictaminis*."

While sympathetic to Grendler's basic position, I differ from him in a number of ways. This is in part explained by the fact that I have endeavored to set medieval schooling in the context of Italian culture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. I suggest the following: (1) the dearth of interest in ancient literature was general until the last decade of the twelfth century; (2) the revival of the study of the classics, whether informal or formal, in a few selected cities by the middle of the thirteenth century resulted in a new interest in composing Latin poetry; (3) a reform of grammar education at the university level was underway in the course of the thirteenth century at Padua, Bologna, and probably Arezzo; (4) in the Veneto the reform of the grammar school curriculum, while still scattered by 1300, probably began, at least in Padua, decades earlier (see ch. 3); and (5) reform of grammar education in most areas of central and northern Italy was postponed until the late fourteenth century or beyond. Consequently, I would qualify Grendler's general observation that for most of the fourteenth century, "a few ancient poetic classics" were studied in Italian grammar schools. As for training in rhetoric at both grammar and university levels, I agree with Grendler's position on the monopoly of *ars dictaminis*.

[5] The most complete biography of Placentinus is by Hermann Kantorowicz, "The Political Sermon of a Medieval Jurist: Placentinus and his 'Sermo de Legibus,'" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 2 (1938): 22–41. Placentinus's *Sermo de legibus* in *prosimetron*, delivered in Bologna in 1185 or 1189 and designed to dazzle his

long residence in southern France explains his interest in ancient literature at this early date. In any case, Italian lawyers of the next generations, such as Azzo (d. 1230) and Accursius (1181/85–1259/63), while they did not include as many classical references in their legal commentaries as Placentinus had, did include some, indicating that they possessed better knowledge of antiquity than had their predecessors a century before.[6]

We cannot know from the increasing number of references to ancient authors in a wide variety of texts whether the writers of those texts were only borrowing citations from the *artes*, i.e., the manuals, or had direct contact with the texts themselves, either in a formal schoolroom setting or through independent study. If we are to believe the braggart Boncompagno, his knowledge of antiquity came not from formal training in school but largely from reading on his own.[7] That no Italian commentary on an ancient author, the surest sign that the ancient author was being taught to students, can definitely be assigned to the period 1190–1250, raises the question of how extensively the ancient literary works were taught even after 1190, and even in Bologna.[8] Given their respect for French classicism, it is possible that Italian grammarians relied on the rich tradition of French commentaries for their lessons, but nevertheless, the absence of any surviving Italian contribution suggests that down at least to the middle of the Duecento, the new concern with Latin grammar was

---

students as well as his critics, is replete with classical citations. *Prosimetron* is a genre of composition in which prose passages alternate with poetry.

[6] Francisco de Zulueta, "Footnotes to Savigny on Azo's *Lectura in Codicum*," in *Studi in onore di Pietro Bonfante nel XL anno d'insegnamento*, 4 vols. (Milan, 1930), 3:267–68, identifies references in Azzo to Virgil, Juvenal, Persius, Gellius, Ovid's *Ars amoris* and *Heroides*, and Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid*. Bruno Paradisi, "Osservazioni sull'uso del metodo dialettico nei glossatori del sec. XII," in his *Studi sul medioevo giuridico*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1987), 2:709, refers to Accursius's citations.

[7] In that brief portion of the *Rhetorica antiqua* or *Boncompagnus* edited by L. Rockinger, *Briefsteller und Formelbücher des eilften bis vierzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Quellen und Eröterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte, no. 9 in 2 vols. (Munich, 1863), 1:131, Boncompagno writes: "... te certifico, quod inter floride civitatis Florentie ubera primitive scientie lac suscepi set totum studendi spatium sub doctore sedecim mensium terminum non excessit."

[8] I am assuming here that the two commentaries identified by Munk Olsen for the twelfth century (see note 1, above) and Pierpont Morgan Library, 404 were not copied in the last decade of the century. On Ventura da Foro di Longulo's commentary on Persius of the 1250s, see below, pp. 89-90.

not matched by an equal interest in the works from which that grammar drew many of its examples. Certainly efforts to focus training in grammar on ancient authors would have encountered resistance from the practical approach to grammar dominant in Italian education, which was concerned with providing the student with an elementary foundation in Latin before sending him on to professional training in the Church, the notariate, the law, or medicine. In fact, it is easy to imagine that the new concern with grammar at first had little to do with learning Latin literature and was initially motivated by the need of lawyers for a more thorough understanding of the Justinian corpus.[9]

In any case, revived interest in Latin grammar and ancient literature could not on its own have fostered Italian humanism. Without a change in taste, manifested as a single-minded pursuit of the integrity of the classical mode, even an intense search for lost Latin authors and a diligent study of the contents of their works would only have continued the twelfth-century French practice of incorporating fragments of ancient works in piecemeal fashion into contemporary literary work, while ignoring the context whence the fragments came. The origins of Italian humanism were necessarily linked, therefore, to a classicizing aesthetic driven by a serious effort to imitate ancient models.

1

The new aesthetic initially manifested itself in the second half of the thirteenth century in the imitation of ancient poetry. There was nothing original in looking to the ancients for poetic materials. An earlier series of narrative–descriptive poems, constituting almost the entire production of Latin poetry in northern and central Italy in the twelfth century, had already generously borrowed images, phrases, and allusions from a narrow range of pagan authors, whose works constituted something of a storehouse of *membra disiecta* ready for

[9] The close link between grammar and the study of the law in late-twelfth-century France, together with the effort of grammarians at Bologna ca. 1200 to establish their authority as interpreters of Roman law, is the subject of a chapter in my *The Two Cultures of Italy*.

use.[10] In that earlier poetry, however, the ancient poetic elements, disparate and truncated, functioned as individual ornaments awkwardly placed in loosely crafted verses, often structured paratactically like prose.

By contrast, the best poetry of the early humanists reveals that they conceived of the borrowed elements as having been integral parts of ancient poems. When wrenching the material from its place for use in a new composition, the humanist poet sought to confront various resonances of still-living fragments and accommodate them within his new creation. A challenge to his talent, the task of manipulation, when successfully executed, promised to magnify the expressive power of the humanist text by evoking the ancient texts to which it remained tacitly connected.

In this effort, the Italian humanists were not without medieval predecessors. French poets of the twelfth century, such as Hildebert of Lavardin (1056–1133); Walter of Châtillon (d. 1184?), author of the *Alexandreis*; and the mysterious Marcus Valerius, had so successfully mastered imitation of ancient Latin poets that some of their creations might easily pass as having been composed by ancient authors.[11] Scholars have argued that these poets constituted a loose group of *antiqui*, who disagreed with the modernist tendency of their

[10] See, for example, the edition of Mosè del Brolo's *Liber Pergaminus* in Guglielmo Gorni, "Il *Liber pergaminus* di Mosè del Brolo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 11 (1970): 440–56; *Liber Maiolichinus de gestis Pisanorum illustribus, poema della guerra baleanica secondo il cod. pisano Roncioni*, ed. C. Calisse, FSI, no. 29 (Rome, 1904), 5–134; and the collection of poems found in G. Chiri, *La poesia epico-storica latina dell'Italia medioevale* (Modena, 1939).

[11] Janet Martin, "Classicism and Style in Latin Literature," *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, with Carol Lanham (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 553–54, 556–57, 561, 563, and 565, with bibliography. According to Paul Klopsch, *Einführung in die mittellateinische Verslehre* (Darmstadt, 1972), 82, Joseph of Exeter followed the rules of classical prosody closely. Nonetheless, Martin refers to his style as "manneristic" (Martin, "Classicism," 561).

Even when heavily dependent on ancient models, contemporary Latin prose was less successfully classicizing than poetry. Among the best prose examples, see Guillaume de Poitiers, *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, ed. and trans. Raymonde Foreville (Paris, 1952), with Foreville's assessment of its style (xxxviii–xliii); *Vita Henrici IV* and discussion by Johannes Schneider, *Die Vita Henrici IV und Sallust: Studien zu Stil und Imitation in der mittellateinischen Prosa*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, no. 49 (Berlin, 1955), 43–130; and for a general assessment of Hildebert of Lavardin's letters, the most classicizing of his prose writings, see the summary by Peter von Moos, *Hildebert von Lavardin, 1056–1133: Humanitas an der Schwelle des Höfischen Zeitalters*, Pariser Historische Studien, no. 3 (Stuttgart, 1965), 63.

contemporaries, most clearly evident in the manuals of *ars poetrie*, to criticize ancient poets and celebrate the superiority of their own work. An analysis of the writings of the few identifiable *antiqui*, however, casts doubt on their loyalty to classical standards, because it shows that the poets were hardly consistent in their aesthetic tastes.[12]

Whereas beginning in the second half of the thirteenth century, the early Italian humanists considered *vetustas*, or the "flavor of antiquity," an overriding aesthetic ideal, the twelfth-century French *antiqui* appear to have enjoyed composing poetry in a variety of styles, and their classicizing efforts look very much like *tours de force*. Hildebert of Lavardin, most of whose poetry was what Janet Martin has labeled "manneristic," could on occasion mix styles in the same poem.[13] Walter of Châtillon's taste in poetry ran from rhyming Latin verse to classicizing epic.[14] Marcus Valerius, an unidentified French poet of the second half of the twelfth century, could write a book of eclogues skillfully imitating Virgil, but he self-consciously chose to set them forth in a mannerist frame by means of a preface, part of which read:

---

[12] On the tension between *antiqui* and *moderni*, see the bibliography given by Martin, "Classicism," 565. See as well Klopsch, *Einführung*, 72, who writes: "... vor allem in Frankreich wird diese Scheidung in einen 'mittelalterlichen' und einen 'antikisierenden' Typ des Hexameters besonders deutlich." Mattieu de Vendôme, *Ars versificatoria*, in his *Opera*, ed. F. Munari, 3 vols. (Rome, 1988), 3:196, is extremely critical of what he regards as poetic abuses by ancient poets. Among such abuses, he includes figurative constructions which, he writes, "a modernorum exercitio debent relegari, licet ab auctoribus inducantur, ut apud Virgilium in Eneydis: 'Pars arduus altis/ Pulverulentus equis furit.' Item Stacius: 'Haec manus Adrastum numero ter mille secuti.'" He does not excuse the ancients' use of poetic license: "In hoc enim articulo modernis incumbit potius antiquorum apologia quam imitatio" (ibid.). For Munari's comments on Mattieu's style, see *Piramus et Tisbe, Milo, Epistule, Tobias*, in *Opera*, 2:39–42. The same critical attitude toward the ancients is found in thirteenth-century authors of prose manuals.

In his *Summa dictaminis*, the thirteenth-century Flemish rhetorician Jacques de Dinant pointedly criticized ancient writers like Cicero and Seneca for permitting hiatus and elision of *m* before vowels: Emil Polak, *A Textual Study of Jacques de Dinant's Summa dictaminis* (Geneva, 1975), 78 and 81–82. The Italian Boncompagno confidently claimed in the beginning of his *Rhetorica novissima* (1225) that he intended to replace Cicero's outdated rhetorical teaching: *Rhetorica novissima*, ed. A. Gaudenzi, in *Scripta anecdota antiquissimorum glossatorum*, Biblioteca iuridica medii aevi, ed. Giovanni Palmerio et al., 3 vols. (Bologna, 1888–1903), 2:252. There are many examples of such prejudice against the ancients in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

[13] Martin, "Classicism and Style," 553.

[14] Walter's classicizing epic *Galteri de Castellione, Alexandreis*, ed. Marvin Colker (Padua, 1978), contrasts sharply with his poems in *Moralish–satirische Gedichten Walters v. Châtillon*, ed. Karl Strecker (Heidelberg, 1929).

Fortunatorum diffamavere trophea
Indelimatis plurime carminibus,
Commemoraverunt praetermittenda frequenter
Pretermiserunt commemorabilia.[15]

While words of more than four syllables were rare in ancient poetry, the author here strove to fulfill elegiac meter with as few words of as many syllables as possible.

Because most of the supposed *antiqui* used not only classicizing but also modern styles in their poetry, it is difficult to judge to what extent they actually disagreed with writers of the manuals of *ars poetrie*. The *antiqui*'s very versatility could in fact lend support to the modernist position. Modern poets were able to write not only in styles used by the ancients but in other ones as well. Despite their talent at classicizing, consequently, the complexity of their aesthetic tastes impeded a prolonged, constant focus on ancient literature and denied them the discovery, made later by the Italian humanists, of the cultural otherness of ancient society, which in turn nourished a full-fledged historical sense of society both ancient and contemporary.

The twelfth-century French were simply not driven to ancient literature and history by the extraliterary concerns that would impinge upon Italians in the next century. The absence of a cultural milieu supportive of classicizing poetry in France helps explain why the brilliant imitation of antiquity there remained sporadic and the scattered masters left no disciples. The burden of this chapter is to trace the Italian beginnings of a major change in aesthetic taste characterized by a new desire to embrace ancient style as *the* model for imitation, a desire that was widely enough shared for it to serve as the focus for a literary movement. Whence, then, the source of the new aesthetic in Italy?

---

[15] The *Bucolica* is edited by Franco Munati, 2nd ed. (Florence, 1970). The passage cited is found at 4: Prologus, lines 13–16. See as well O. Skutsch, "Textual Studies in the *Bucolics* of Marcus Valerius," in *Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed. Charles Henderson, 2 vols. (Rome, 1964), 2:21–6. Valerius's play on forms of *commemorare* and *praetermittere* in the third and fourth lines is typical of the puns popular in his century. In line 2, the word *plurime* is metrically incorrect. The author probably wrote *plurima*. If this is the case, the selected passage reads in translation: "They have defamed the [many] triumphs of the fortunate with crude poems/ They have commemorated frequently matters that should be forgotten/ They have neglected things that should be remembered." The preface appears designed as a framing device of contrast for the classicizing bucolics that follow.

Interest was likely awakened by a contemporary passion for vernacular poetry, influenced by Provençal and northern French models, which developed steadily from the late twelfth century. The growing popular delight with vernacular composition seems to have revived the interest of learned men in writing Latin poems. As we shall see, at least Lovato dei Lovati (1240/41–1309), a Latin poet, expressly saw himself in rivalry with vernacular poets. Therefore, prior to identifying the origins of the classicizing poetic style, we shall explore the factors that may have awakened Italians to the beauties of poetry generally and may have led to the development of both vernacular and Latin poetic movements. This investigation necessitates a brief examination of some major political and social developments in northern and central Italy in the late twelfth century.

The Treaty of Constance of 1183, which concluded the wars between Frederick Barbarossa and the Lombard communes, rendered the communes *de facto* almost completely autonomous.[16] The emancipation of the communes from imperial authority, however, had repercussions for other territorial rulers in the old Italian kingdom. Especially lordships in the Piedmont, Liguria, and Lombardy, previously favored by emperors as bulwarks for defending imperial claims in the face of aggressive communal governments, now also assumed the role of independent powers.[17] Although generally trailing the

[16] For a brief discussion of the peace, see Edouard Jordan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, in *Histoire du moyen âge*, vol. 4.1 (Paris, 1939), 141–42; Paolo Lamma, "I comuni italiani e la vita europea," *Storia d'Italia*, ed. G. Arnaldi et al., 2nd ed, 5 vols. (Turin, 1965), 1:388–90; G.C. Mor, "Il trattato di Costanza e la vita comunale italiana," in *Popolo e stato in Italia nell'età di Federico Barbarosa: Alessandria e la lega lombarda* (Turin, 1970), 363–77; and Alfred Haverkamp, "Der Konstanzer Friede zwischen Kaiser und Lombardenbund (1183)," *Kommunale Bündnisse Oberitaliens und Oberdeutschlands im Vergleich*, ed. H. Maurer, Vorträge und Forschungen, no. 33 (1987), 11–61. Although the Peace of Constance affected only the cities of the Lombard League, within a few years the same autonomy was extended to the major cities of the Piedmont, Tuscany, and the Romagna: Gina Fasoli, "La politica di Federico Barbarossa dopo Costanza," in *Popolo e stato in Italia*, 396–97.

[17] A.M. Nada Patrone and Gabriella Arnaldi, *Comuni e signori nell'Italia settentrionale: Il Piemonte e la Liguria*, Storia d'Italia, vol. 5 (Turin, 1965), 30–32. The basic narrative of events for medieval Piedmont is Francesco Cognasso, *Il piemonte nell'età sveva* (Turin, 1968).

From the time of the Diet of Roncaglia in 1158, Barbarossa demonstrated a flexible policy in dealing with the great feudal lords and the cities, now favoring one group and now another, depending on his needs: Alfred Haverkamp, *Herrschaftsformen der Frühstaufer in Reichsitalien*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1970), 373–75 and 434–35. As in Germany, however, Barbarossa also formed a group of counts and marquesses linked to him directly by ties of vassalage, whose family lands became designated as marks

communes in aggressiveness, the lords of these territories, such as the marquises of Monferrato and Malaspina and the Count of Saluzzo, showed themselves eager to tighten control over their territories. Coincident with the move toward autonomy on the part of the lords came the first signs of a courtly culture, with its attendant patronage of arts and literature. The *Magna curia* of Frederick II, which did not fully function until the 1220s, reinforced the courtly tendencies already at work in the principalities north of Rome.[18] The link between the rise of Italian court culture and the Italian reception of Provençal vernacular poetry, French epic, and French romance literature was dramatically illustrated in 1205, when Raimbaut de Vacqueiras, a Provençal troubadour, praised the Marquis of Monferrato:

> Alexander left you his generosity, and Roland and the twelve peers their daring, and the gallant Berart lady-service and graceful discourse. In your court reign all good usages, munificence and service of ladies, elegant raiment, handsome armor, trumpets and diversions and viols

---

or counties with no reference to pre-existing territorial boundaries. Those great nobles subsequently exploited their titles to claim territorial power over the area surrounding their holdings and established their superiority over local signorial powers through feudal arrangements, much as the emperor had done with them: M. Nobili, "L'evoluzione delle dominazioni marchionali in relazione alla dissoluzione delle circoscrizioni marchionali e comitali e allo sviluppo della politica territoriale dei comuni cittadini dell'Italia centro-settentrionale (secoli XI e XII)," in *La cristianità dei secoli XI e XII in Occidente: Coscienza e strutture di una società, Atti del'VIII Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 30 giugno–5 luglio 1980*, (Mendola, 1983), 235–58; and Renato Bordone, "L'influenza culturale e istituzionale nel regno d'Italia," in *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des Staufischen Kaisers*, ed. A. Haverkamp, Vorträge und Forschungen, no. 40 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 165–67. Raoul Manselli, "La grande feudalità italiana tra Federico Barbarossa e i Comuni," in *Popolo e stato in Italia*, 360–61, expresses a more negative view of the situation of the great feudal princes after Constance.

For a detailed account of the process of consolidation in Monferrato, see Leopoldo Usseglio, *I marchesi di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante i secoli XI e XII*, Biblioteca della Società storica subalpina, vols. 101–02 (Turin, 1926).

[18] Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, trans. E. Jephcott, 2 vols. (New York, 1982), 2:259–64, traces the civilizing effects of court life in the larger territorial lordships of northern Europe, but his remarks apply as well to northern Italian principalities.

In the atmosphere of Frederick II's imperial court, a northern Italian like Quilichino da Spoleto could produce Latin poetry. His *Historia Alexandri magni* has been edited by W. Kirsch (Skopje, 1971). A second work attributed to Quilichino was convincingly shown by Kirsch to be the work of Terrisius of Atina: W. Kirsch, "Quilichinus oder Terrisius? Zur Autorschaft des Rhythmus 'Cesar Auguste multum mirabilis,'" *Philologus* 117 (1973): 250–63.

> and song, and at the hour of dining it has never pleased you to see a keeper at the door.[19]

For Raimbaut, music, poetry, and munificence were intrinsic features of the courtly life, to whose creation the lords aspired.

Troubadours made their first appearance in the area north of Rome, in the small northern Italian courts, at the very end of the twelfth century, and within decades the lyric poetry of Provence had diffused throughout the peninsula. The epics and romances of northern France, however, appear to have been in circulation much earlier. The iconography of Roland and Oliver in the carvings of the cathedral of Modena (1120–40) and Verona (1139) are perhaps the earliest artistic representations of the Charlemagne epic anywhere.[20] In Tuscany, the incidence of first names testifies to the diffusion of the Roland story: in the 1170s, two documents from Passignano refer to a Turpin and an Orlando in the area, while nearby, in 1219 and 1244, official lists of Pistoia residents reveal thirteen Orlandos or Rolandos, seven Orlandinos, nine Oliveros, one Carlo, two Pepi, a Roncivalle, and a Pepina. The appearance of names from the Arthurian cycle in Italian documents in 1114, 1125, and 1136 indicates that those legends were known in Italy even earlier.[21]

Elaborate stories like those of the romance or epic might have exercised a popular attraction in any generation, but the burst of interest in French tales in the years around 1200, as well as the rapid diffusion of Provençal lyric, albeit among a narrower circle, raises the

---

[19] *The Poems of the Troubadour Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, ed. and trans. J. Linskill (The Hague, 1964), epic letter III, lines 99–106 (308). Cited from Carol Lansing, *The Florentine Magnates: Lineage and Faction in a Medieval Commune* (Princeton, 1991), 157.

[20] For the early documentary instances, see E.G. Gardner, *Arthurian Legends in Italian Literature* (London and New York, 1930), 3, 5, and 19. It is probable that an early version of the *Chanson de Roland* was composed in southern Italy, possibly as early as the late eleventh century: Aurelio Roncaglia, "Le corti medievali," *LI* 1:95–97. For the earliest appearances in art, see Lorenzo Renzi, "Il francese come lingua letteraria e il franco-lombardo: L'epoca carolingia nel Veneto," *SCV* 1:566–67. In 1192/93, Henry of Settimello indirectly referred to Tristan and Arthur in his *Elegia*, apparently confident that his public would appreciate his meaning. For these passages, see Enzo Bonaventura, "Arrigo da Settimello e l'*Elegia de diversitate fortunae et philosophiae consolatione*," *Studi medievali* 4 (1912–13): 157–60.

[21] Robert Davidsohn, *Die Geschichte von Florenz*, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1896–1927), 1:815, for Passignano. For names at Pistoia, see David Herlihy, "Tuscan Names, 1200–1500," *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988): 568. See as well the evidence in Lansing, *Florentine Magnates*, 156.

question of what resonances in particular this literature struck in Italian society at that time. In all probability, the success of the new literature was encouraged by a series of social, cultural, and political events taking place in these areas of the peninsula around 1200.

One such event was a contemporary crisis in communal governments, which brought into question the political leadership of the consular regimes. The twelfth century, a period of tremendous population growth, urban migration, and economic development in northern and central Italian urban areas, had witnessed a striking degree of social mobility. The tendency for successful families rising from below to display their arrival in the top ranks of society by adopting a knightly lifestyle seems to have encountered little resistance from those already at the top.[22] By the late twelfth century,

[22] I purposely ignore here the issue of to what extent the older knightly families of the twelfth century had initially been a blood nobility that only in this century associated itself with knighthood. The issue also concerns the extent to which the concept of nobility had previously been amorphous – Marc Bloch refers to it as "noblesse de fait" – until given form by knighthood in the twelfth century: Giovanni Tabacco, "Su nobilità e cavalleria nel medioevo: Un ritorno a Marc Bloch?" *Rivista storica italiana* 91 (1979): 5–25; also found in *Studi di storia medievale e moderna per Ernesto Sestan*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1980), 1:31–55.

For Georges Duby's position, see his "La noblesse dans la France médiévale," in his *Hommes et structures du moyen âge: Recueil d'articles* (Paris, 1973), 145–66; "Structures de parenté et noblesse dans la France du Nord aux XIe et XIIe siècles," in ibid., 267–85; "Situation de la noblesse en France au debut du XIIIe siècle," in ibid., 343–52; and "Lignage, noblesse et chevalerie au XIIe siècle dans la region mâconnaise: Une revision," in ibid., 395–424. The collection has been translated into English by C. Postan, *The Chivalrous Society* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1979). For more recent work on France, see Theodore Evergates, "Nobles and Knights in Twelfth-Century France," in *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Thomas N. Bisson (Philadelphia, 1995), 11, n. 3. Evergates's conclusion for France strikes me as convincing on the basis of the latest evidence: "Nobility and knighthood denoted entirely separate characteristics, neither signifying the other; indeed, the knights comprised a remarkably diverse group that included both noble and non-noble allodial proprietors, as well as impecunious men of all social backgrounds" (17).

For Italy, see Giovanni Tabacco, "Nobilità e potere ad Arezzo in età comunale," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 15 (1974): 1–24, and "Nobili e cavalieri a Bologna e a Firenze fra XII e XIII secolo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 17 (1976): 41–79; Franco Cardini, *Alle radici della cavalleria medievale* (Florence, 1981) and "'Nobiltà e cavalleria nei centri urbani: Problemi e interpretazioni," *Nobilità e ceti dirigenti in Toscana nei secoli XI–XIII: Strutture e concetti* (Florence, 1982), 13–28; Hagen Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien, 9. bis 12. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1979), and his "Adel und Rittertum: Ritterstand nach italienischen Zeugnissen des 11.–14. Jahrhunderts," in *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Josef Fleckenstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. L. Fenske, W. Rosener and T. Zotz (Sigmaringen, 1984), 581–608;

consular families, which had dominated communal society throughout most of the century, came to include families of *milites* (knights) from a variety of backgrounds, each in its own way successful in the evolving economy.[23]

The power exercised by the amalgam of *milites* of diverse origins was disrupted in the decades around 1200, in the aftermath of the Treaty of Constance. Freed from outside pressure first by Constance and then by a long period of imperial instability after the death of Henry VI in 1196, the communes of central and northern Italy witnessed an intensification of factional warfare among consular families that not only discredited aristocratic government but also encouraged demands by the swelling numbers of *populares* in the cities for greater participation in communal affairs.[24]

Urban violence flared up in northern Italy, beginning with Brescia in 1196, followed by Piacenza and Cremona in 1198, and Reggio Emilia in 1199 and 1200.[25] Such violence was less frequent in central Italy, but not uncommon. This is not the place to determine to what extent these were class wars, on the one hand, or disputes between factions, each composed of a variety of social groups, on the other.[26]

J. Flori, "Le origini dell'ideologia cavalleresca (a proposito di un libro recente)," *Archivio storico italiano* 143 (1985): 3–13; and Philip Jones, *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria* (Oxford, 1997), 110–12.

[23] For the development in the area of Verona and Treviso, see Andrea Castagnetti, "Appunti per una storia sociale e politica delle città della Marca Veronese–Trevigiana (secoli XI–XIV)," in *Aristocrazia cittadina e ceti popolari nel tardo Medioevo in Italia e in Germania*, ed. Reinhard Elze and Gina Fasoli (Bologna, 1984), 49; for the Padua area, Gina Fasoli, "Oligarchia e ceti popolari nelle città padane fra il XIII e il XIV secolo," in ibid., 13–16; and generally, Philip Jones, "Storia economica: Dalla caduta dell'Impero romano al secolo XIV," *Storia d'Italia*, vol. 2.2 (Turin, 1974), 1798, with bibliography.

[24] Ibid., 1799. Cf. Jones, *The Italian City-State*, 499–506.

[25] John Koenig, *Il "popolo" dell'Italia del Nord nel XIII secolo* (Bologna, 1986), 7–8.

[26] Early scholarly discussions of the social forces involved in urban violence in thirteenth-century Italian cities focused on Florence. Scholars divided between two essential positions, that the conflict arose from class struggle or that it arose from factions among the upper class and their supporters. For recent bibliography, see Lansing, *The Florentine magnates*, 17–22. John Koenig, *Il "popolo,"* 20–24, interprets conflict in the northern Italian towns along the lines of the class thesis for Florence. In Koenig's view, the growth of communal power before 1250 was directly related to the success of the hitherto disenfranchised classes in the towns of the north in using the power of the commune to control the selfish interests of the urban aristocracy, whose power base lay both in the city and the surrounding countryside. In other words, he rejects as inapplicable to the urban violence of northern Italy before 1250

The important fact for our purposes is that despite internal disruptions, almost everywhere from 1200 onwards the commune increased its control of urban life and exerted more power over the surrounding countryside. Beginning in the late twelfth century, one commune after another began appointing a *podestà*, an outside official whose task it was to keep order in communal politics. Already by the first decade of the thirteenth century, the office of the *podestà* had become institutionalized, and the communal form of government began to assume the "constitutional physiognomy" that it retained (with certain modifications) until its demise. The councils of the commune – their names varied from city to city – became the focal point in the struggle for control of communal power among the various factions and classes.[27] By bringing into question the legitimacy of regimes controlled by *milites*, (that is, by members of old feudal families and "new men," whose wealth and knightly style of life identified them as *milites*, the popular challenge undercut the assumption that *milites* had a natural entitlement to power.[28]

Vital to the commune's expansion were the elaboration of its institutional structure and the definition of citizenship with its incumbent rights and duties. Among the citizens, an élite emerged who, because of noble status, were exempt from communal taxation and allowed to

---

the model that sees the warring parties as each composed of different social groups. All the same, he is willing to acknowledge the validity of the other model for Florence and possibly after 1250 for northern Italy. He distinguishes between Florence and northern Italy on the grounds that Tuscan merchants were politically more powerful and landed interests weaker than were comparable groups in northern Italy. Consequently, the ruling factions in Tuscany were more composite and opposition to their domination as a group more complex (23–24, n. 57). The detailed analysis of politics in Brescia given by James Powell, however, *Albertanus of Brescia: The Pursuit of Happiness in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1992), 18–32, suggests that in the case of violence there (1196), the earliest example of large-scale urban violence after Constance, the divisions were more complicated than Koenig allows.

[27] I draw the phrase "constitutional physiognomy" from Romolo Caggese, *Dal concordato di Worms alla fine della prigionia di Avignone (1122–1377)* (Turin, 1939), 170–71. Koenig, *Il "popolo,"* 409–10, credits this expansion of communal power to the influence of the "borghesia comunale." See also Keller, "Adel und Ritterstand," 595; Giovanni Tabacco, *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of Political Rule*, trans. R.B. Jensen (Cambridge and New York, 1989), 223–24; and Jones, *The Italian City-State*, 408–09.

[28] On the nobles' conviction that they were intended by birth for rule, see M. Luzzati, "Le origini di una famiglia nobile pisana: Roncioni nei secoli XII e XIII," *Bulletino senese di storia patria* 73–75 (1966–68): 67, cited in Giovanni Tabacco, *Egemonie sociali e strutture del potere nel medioevo italiano*, 2nd ed. (Turin, 1979), 287, n. 87.

carry arms. Decisions had to be made about the credentials of families who, because of their wealth and their role in the communal army, had heretofore been tacitly considered knightly but whose genuine noble antecedents were in doubt. Lumped in with the *populares*, such families became subject to the same burdens as other members of the popular order.[29] Unlike the direct assault on the consular families by the *populares*, the concurrent initiatives by town governments aimed at reducing the size of the nobility derived not from hostility to the *milites* themselves, but more from a concern to share the fiscal burdens of increasing communal budgets among as many taxpayers as possible. Both developments, however, brought into focus the question of the attributes and functions of knighthood.

These sweeping changes in Italian society in the decades around 1200 made Italians particularly susceptible to the attractions of French literature in both the *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oïl*. The dreamworld of the romance and the spiritualized love of the troubadour embodied a constellation of values – courage, honor, fealty, elegant manners – that set the standards of conduct for the knightly class, legitimated its claims to special privilege, and arguably conditioned the conduct of many people further down the social hierarchy who had no hope of leading such a life.[30] As we shall see later, the insistent efforts of the *populares* to acquire greater political stature repeatedly brought the aristocratic ethic into question and prepared the way for the formation of a new ethic of civic responsibility largely antipathetic to the values of knighthood.

---

[29] Keller, "Adel, Rittertum und Ritterstand," 595–96.

[30] Stephen C. Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939–1210* (Philadelphia, 1985), describes a tenth- and eleventh-century court culture valuing easy social manner, eloquent speech, good humor, physical beauty, and fastidious dress, that is, qualities in which clerics as well as laymen could share. While skill at arms was an attribute of lay courtliness, it was not a defining one. From the twelfth century, however, the emphasis in courtliness appears to shift toward the military character of the noble. Enshrined in the new courtly literature was the aesthetic and moral model of the knight, dedicated to loyal service whether to his lady, his God, his king, or all three.

Although Aldo Scaglione, *Knights at Court: Courtliness, Chivalry, and Courtesy from Ottonian Germany to the Italian Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991), 175–87, does not distinguish this development in his discussion of courtliness, he skillfully demonstrates how the newly synthesized ideal worked its way through Italian literature of the late twelfth and the thirteenth century.

2

Although the first surviving poem in Provençal composed in Italy (1194) was written by a native of the Veneto, Peire de la Carvana or Cavarana, the Provençal poet Rimbaut de Vacqueiras had already, perhaps as early as 1175, begun a peripatetic life, moving from Provence to one noble Italian court after another in the mountainous north.[31] A *tenzone* (poetic debate) between him and the Marquis Alberto Malaspina (d. 1206), larded with the grossest mutual insults, distinguishes Alberto as the first Italian nobleman known to have written poetry in Provençal.[32]

By 1225, the interest in southern French poetry was no longer sporadic but extended to an area from Savoy west to the Veneto and south along the western coast to Naples. It was stimulated by approximately forty Provençal troubadours, exiled by the Albigensian Crusade (1208–28), who worked at various times in the area in the first quarter of the century.[33] Those who flourished did so mainly by participating in the life of the new Italian courts, under the patronage of noble houses such as those of Carretto, Malaspina, da Romano, and Este. By the second quarter of the century, Italy itself was producing poets like Buvalelli and the young Sordello, who were a match for the best of the exiles. After 1250, once the immigrants had died off, Italian poets alone carried the tradition of the Provençal lyric down into the fourteenth century.

Scholars are generally agreed that the corpus of Provençal literature was codified not in Provence but in Italy in the thirteenth century and that the poet largely responsible was the Provençal troubadour Uc de Saint Circ. The outlines of Uc's mature life are well-known. Leaving his native Provence for Italy in 1219, he lived

[31] Rita Lejeune, "Le troubadour lombard e la 'galerie littéraire' satirique de Peire d'Alvernhe," *Marche romane* 25 (1975): 31–47, has argued for the unlikely early date of 1157 for Peire de la Carvana's poem. On Rimbaut, see Corrado Bologna, "La letteratura dell'Italia settentrionale nel Duecento," *LI* 1:124–26.

[32] " Le corti medievali," *LI* 1:110. Admitting that both voices in the *tenzone* might have been composed by Raimbaut, Roncaglia argues that the viciousness of the mutual insults guarantees authentic co-authorship.

[33] Ibid., 113. For a general treatment of the development of Provençal literature in Italy, see, in addition to Roncagli, Bologna, "La letteratura dell'Italia settentrionale," 123–41.

there until his death in 1257.[34] After making the rounds of several noble courts in pursuit of stable patronage, Uc established his home in Treviso, a city already well-known for its lavish courtly life.[35] Under the government of the da Romano family, headed by Ezzelino and his brother Alberico (himself an ardent writer of Provençal verse), Treviso provided Uc with the tranquillity and security that he needed to work. In time, Uc made the city the intellectual capital of troubadour literature.

A scholar by nature, Uc had brought with him from Provence in 1219 a body of notes dealing with the settings of the poetry of earlier troubadours. Once in Treviso, he used his notes to write *razos* (commentaries) explaining specific poems. Uc may have drawn on some poems already composed by others, but he was responsible for making a coherent collection of them. The origins of the *vidas* (biographies) of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century troubadours are more complicated.[36] A few were written after Uc's death, but it would seem that most were the product of his hand and date from the 1230s. Traces of Veneto dialect found in the *vidas* may derive from copyists or from Uc himself, who occasionally used local words for expressive purposes in his poetry.[37]

To Uc as well we owe the first major collection of Provençal poetry. The *Liber Alberici*, written sometime before 1254, contains a selection of 250 poems by more than a hundred authors. Likely Uc was also the author of the *Donat provensal*, the first grammar of Provençal composed in Italy.[38] Uc's work made a considerable impression on his contemporaries, a number of whom emulated him in constructing their own collections of Provençal lyrics. The center of the industry was the Veneto. Seven of the ten manuscript collections

[34] An extensive biography of Uc and a discussion of his work are given by Gianfranco Folena, "Tradizione e cultura trobadorica nelle corti e nelle città venete," *SCV* 1:518–37, with bibliography. The following paragraphs on Uc are based on Folena's essay.

[35] Treviso was the site of the "Castello d'amore" incident in 1214, which led to war between Treviso and Padua on one side and the Venetians on the other (ibid., 514–16).

[36] G. Favati has provided an excellent edition of the *vidas* and *razos* in his *Le biografie trobadoriche: Testi provenzali dei sec. XIII e XIV* (Bologna, 1961).

[37] Folena, "Tradizione e cultura," 535.

[38] Folena, 'Tradizione e cultura," 536, suggests that the author of the grammar, who refers to himself as Ugo Faiditus, was actually Uc de Saint-Circ. The adjective *faiditus* would be a nickname, i.e., "the Exiled."

surviving from the thirteenth century were copied there as were twelve of the twenty from the fourteenth.[39]

One of the manuscripts, BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 3207 (H), probably created in the region of Treviso in the last quarter of the thirteenth century, testifies to the interest in Provençal poetry that developed under Uc's influence.[40] The collection was written on a palimpsest containing a text of law or logic – it is difficult to determine which – itself written in the middle part of the century. Set down in two columns with occasional glosses in the margins and with the chapters marked by initials and numbers, the earlier work was a typical textbook. The poetry, copied over the erased text a few decades later, follows the pagination and preserves the double-columned arrangement of the older text with the same number of lines per column, except that the dimensions of the book are reduced by one-half because each page of the older format is now folded in the middle to form two.

Not only does the manuscript assume the formal structure of a school text, but the new text is obviously the object of collation with at least one other manuscript. Marginal and interlinear notes, with alternate readings and blank spaces in the text, indicate that the creator of the manuscript was endeavoring to produce an accurate copy of the poems. Taken together with the collections of *vidas* and *razos*, which anchored the poetry to lives of individual poets, manuscripts like BAV, *Vat. lat.* 3207 (H), which surveyed more than a hundred years of creative work, provided a comprehensive vision of a vernacular poetic tradition. A comparable overview of the ancient Latin literary tradition would not appear before the late fourteenth century. Guittone d'Arezzo (d. 1294) expressed his sense of the integrity of the tradition of Provençal literature when, in his *canzone* on the death of Jacques de Lyon, he referred to the *proensal labore* (the Provençal labor), as if conceiving of the poetry and commentaries as an integrated whole.[41]

---

[39] Corrado Bologna, "Tradizione testuale e fortuna dei classici italiani," *LI* 7.1:452. Of thirteenth-century codices, only one is of Tuscan origin: D'Arco S. Avalle, *La letteratura medievale in lingua d'oc nella sua tradizione manoscritta* (Turin, 1961), 122. This manuscript lacks the *vidas* and *rasos*, suggesting a less scholarly approach to the literature than in the north.

[40] The manuscript is discussed in detail by Maria Careri, *Il canzoniere provenzale H (Vat. Lat. 3207): Struttura, contenuto e fonti* (Modena, 1990).

[41] Francesco Novati, "Se a Vicenza siasi sui primi del secolo 14° impartito un pubblico insegnamento di provenzale," *Rendiconti reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*, 2nd ser. 30 (1897): 211-20.

By Guittone's generation, at least in central Italy, poets, responding to an influence coming from the south, were more devoted to composing in their own language than in a foreign vernacular. Although in the kingdom of Sicily the diffusion of Provençal poetry did not generate a native group of poets writing in Provençal, it did ultimately encourage poets in the suite of Frederick II to compose in Sicilian dialect. The evidence for a direct influence by Provençal is strong. The earliest surviving poetry of what became known as the "Sicilian school" was a series of poems composed from 1233 or 1234 by Giacomo Lentini, who, as *protonotarius* of the emperor, was one of the leading officials of the imperial court.[42] Not only did the poetry draw on Provençal motifs and techniques, but the first poem in the collection was an "artistic translation" of an Occitan original attributed to Folchetto di Marseilles.[43] It seems likely that the Veneto performed a mediating role between southern Italy and Provence: the only surviving manuscript of Provençal poetry containing the poem of Folchetto, BNF, *Fr.* 15211, xiv, originated in the Veneto and, therefore, appears to represent a tradition localized there. Lentini probably based his translation on the poem contained in an ancestor of the Paris manuscript, one perhaps presented to Frederick II during one of his various passages around northern Italy.[44]

Essentially functionaries at the imperial court, the Sicilian poets were of various nationalities and included a number of Tuscans, whose province was to become the center of vernacular Italian poetry later in the century. Cosmopolitan in outlook, the Tuscan poets of the first generation of Italian writers exhibited little sense of a Tuscan linguistic culture. Dependent on the poetry of Lentini and Pier della Vigna, they employed a mixed language of French, Provençal, and Sicilian, with exceptional traces of their native dialects. By the 1250s, though, with the destruction of the Hohenstaufen court, a new generation of Tuscan poets writing in their own cities was using a language fundamentally Tuscan, if localized by municipal dialects.[45]

---

[42] Antonio E. Quaglio, "I poeti della *Magna curia* siciliana," in *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 1, ed. Emilio Pasquini and Antonio Quaglio, vol. 1.1 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi* (Bari, 1970), 191. Cf. G.B. Squarotti, F. Bruni and U. Dotti, *Dalle origini al Trecento*, vol. 1.1 of *Storia della civiltà letteraria italiana* (Turin, 1990), 230–41.

[43] Roncaglia, "Le corti medievali," 142.

[44] Bologna, "Tradizione testuale," 488–90.

[45] Giorgio Petrocchi, "La toscana del Duecento," *LI* 7.1:189–90.

Whereas the Sicilian court poets focused almost solely on the aristocratic theme of love in their work, the later writers of the Tuscan communes expanded the thematic scope of lyric to include subjects of interest to their rapidly developing urban culture. Driven by new ethical, religious, and political concerns, eager to express their patriotism and to trumpet the victories of their cities, the Tuscans turned to twelfth-century Provençal poetry, where they found abundant attention paid to such themes. In some cases (for example, those of Lanfranchi da Pistoia and Dante da Maiano), the contact with the older troubadours led to direct translation of models and to composition in Provençal itself. Generally, though, authors combined Sicilian and Provençal influences into a hybrid language.[46]

As I have suggested, the appearance of French epic and romance poetry written in the *langue d'oïl* in northern and central Italy antedated the arrival of the poetry of the *langue d'oc* by some decades. While Provençal was the language of a single literary genre (the lyric), French was employed in other genres of poetry and especially for prose. The role of French, primarily in the composition of epic, remained a prominent feature of literary production in the Veneto down to the fifteenth century.[47]

For much of the thirteenth century, French was the language of literary prose for Italians in general. Among French prose works by Italians from the Veneto were Martino da Canale's *Estoire de Venise* (1252–68) and Marco Polo's *Divisament dou monde* (1299), which was dictated to Rustichello of Pisa.[48] In Tuscany, the earliest surviving medical tract was written in French; the Florentine Brunetto Latini, while living in France, composed his *Tresor* in French (1262–66); and

[46] Bologna, "Tradizione testuale," 493–518; and Antonio E. Quaglio, "I poeti siculo–toscani," in *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 1.1 (Bari, 1970), 243–47. On Dante da Maiano and Paolo Lanfranchi da Pistoia, see comments of Gianfranco Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 2 vols. (Milan and Naples, 1960), 1:353 and 478.

[47] Alberto Limentani, "L'epica in *Lengue de France: L'Entrée d'Espagne* e Niccolò da Verona," *SCV* 2:338–68; and G.B. Squarotti et al., *Dalle origini al Trecento*, 2:602–11. On French as written in the Veneto, see ibid., 602. The romance in Franco-Venetian prose, *Aquilon de Bavière*, was written between 1379 and 1407: Antonio E. Quaglio, "Retorica, prosa e narrativa del Duecento," in *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 2, ed. N. Mineo, E. Pasquini and A.E. Quaglio, vol. 1.2 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi* (Bari, 1970), 329.

[48] On Canale, see Alberto Limentani, "Martino da Canal e *Les Estoire de Venise*," *SCV* 1:590–601; and on Marco Polo, see Ugo Tucci, "I primi viaggiatori e l'opera di Marco Polo," ibid., 641–61. Cf. Corrado Bologna, "La letteratura dell'Italia settentrionale," 184–87.

somewhat later, Rustichello wrote his prose romance *Meliadus* in French as well.[49] In the fourteenth century, however, regional literary languages confected from local dialects arose, and later Tuscan dialect came to replace French as the language of literary prose almost everywhere in central and northern Italy.

By the mid-thirteenth century, the popularity of French and Provençal vernacular poetry stimulated a taste for poetry as such in northern and central Italy. The general interest in poetry, conjoined with the formal study of ancient Latin poets in a few northern Italian grammar schools and *studi*, encouraged learned poets to try their hand at writing poetry in Latin. Six Latin poets appeared within a twenty-five-year period (ca. 1246–70): Urso in Genoa; Bellino Bissolo, Bonvesin de la Riva, and Stefanardo da Vimercate in Lombardy; Bonifacio in Verona; and Lovato in Padua. Especially in Genoa and the Veneto, areas where there was intense interest in composing poetry in Provençal, poets' experience of expressing thoughts and emotions in a formalized poetic form may have carried over into the composition of Latin verse.

Lovato dei Lovati, the greatest poet of the group, implied that the popularity of vernacular poetry spurred him to write Latin poetry out of a spirit of competition. So he suggested in a letter that he wrote about 1290 to his friend, Bellino Bissolo, a Latin poet who, perhaps only for the purpose of argument, was apparently willing to champion the vernacular against Lovato's criticisms.[50] Walking through the city of Treviso one day, Lovato told Bellino in his metric letter, he had come across a singer on a high stage "bellowing the battles of Charlemagne and French exploits" in French, "gaping in barbarous fashion, rolling them out as he pleased, no part of them in their

[49] For Latini, see ch. 5, below. The medical book of Aldobrandino da Siena, *Le régime du corps de maître Aldobrandin da Siena: Texte français du XIIIe siècle*, ed. Louis Landouzy and Roger Pépin (Paris, 1911), was written before 1287: Bodo Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," in *Die italienische Literatur im Zeitalter Dantes und am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Renaissance*, ed. August Buck, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1987), 2:234. On Rustichello, see E. Löseth, *Le Roman en prose de Tristan, le Roman de Palamède et la compilation de Rusticien de Pise: Analyse critique d'après les manuscrits de Paris* (Paris, 1891; rpt. Geneva, 1974), 423–74, outlining the *Meliadus*. Löseth dates the work ca. 1271 (473).

[50] The poem is published with English translation by William P. Sisler, "An Edition and Translation of Lovato Lovati's 'Metrical Epistles' with Parallel Passages from Ancient Authors," Ph.D. Diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1977, 38–43 (Lat.) and 50–55 (Eng.). For further references on this poem, see below, p. 96, n. 42.

proper order, songs relying on no effort."[51] Nevertheless, the listeners had hung on every word.

While recognizing the wisdom of maintaining the middle course between writing verses for the few and for the many, Lovato declared that "if you must err on one side, it should be on the side of daring."[52] He would rather die with the Seven on the plain of Thebes "than be marked for death while shamefully running away."[53] The obvious reference here was to his intention to write his poetry in Latin as opposed to the vernacular.

> Do you despise him [the courageous poet] because he believes that one must follow in the footsteps of the ancient poets (*veterum vestigia vatum*) or because he subordinates a discourse well-formed with metric rules suited to its subject, lest the word becomes the predominant concern and the subject perish? Or because he mocks the verses of rhythmic compositions where rhyme distorts the meaning?[54]

---

[51] Lovato, Letter 2, lines 7–10, in Sisler, *An Edition*, 38: "Francorum dedita linguae/ Carmina barbarico passim deformat hiatu,/ Tramite nulla suo, nulli innitentia penso/ Ad libitum volvens." The translation is Sisler's, 50. The mid-thirteenth-century jurist Odolfredo mentions "blind men" who sing of Roland and Oliver in the piazzas for money: N. Tamassia, *Odolfredo: Studio storico–giuridico* (Bologna, 1894), 176. The work was concurrently published in *Atti e memorie della deputazione di storia patria per le province di Romagna*, 3rd ser., 11 (1893): 183–225, and 12 (1894): 1–83 and 330–390. Tamassia cites a Bolognese statute of 1288, forbidding Frenchmen from singing in the piazzas of the city: "Ut cantatores Francigenorum in plateis Communis ad cantandum omnino morari non possint": ibid., 176. D. Guerri, *La corrente popolare nel Rinascimento: Berte, burle e baie nella Firenze del Brunellesco e del Burchiello* (Florence, 1931), 20, remarks that at least by the fifteenth century the Florentines were entertained in the piazzas not by chivalric tales but by satires attacking well-known local personalities.

On these lines of Lovato's poem, see the exposition of Walter Ludwig, *Litterae neolatinae: Schriften zur neulateinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1989), 10–11.

[52] Lovato, 2:73–74, in Sisler, *An Edition*, 41: "Si tamen alterutra fuerit tibi parte cadendum,/ Audendum magis est." The translation is in Sisler, *An Edition*, 53.

[53] Lovato, 2:75–77, in Sisler, *An Edition*, 41: "potius me saeva trisulci/ Fulminis ira necet Capaneia bella moventem,/ quam notet exitio turpis fuga." The translation is on 53.

[54] Lovato, 287–91, in Sisler, *An Edition*, 42:

> Quod sectanda putat veterum vestigia vatum,
> Despicis aut metrica quod cogit lege decentem
> Sermonem servire rei, ne principe verbo
> Res mutata cadat? Quod textus metra canori
> Ridet, ubi intentum concinna vocabula torquent?

The translation is mine. For a close analysis of this passage, see Ludwig, *Litterae Neolatinae*, 31–32.

Presumably Bellino had criticized Lovato in a previous letter for his rigid adherence to ancient poetic standards, as well as for his belief that rhyme sacrificed music for meaning. Despite Bellino's criticism, Lovato continued,

> I shall bear it. I won't change my mind. I stand fast, as is my habit, and I won't correct the vice of my long disease.[55]

This letter of ca. 1290 conveys the elitism of Lovato, who looked down on vernacular literature as inferior to Latin. Sensitive to the isolation of his position, he presented his stance as something akin to heroism. As late as this date, he did not feel himself part of a group or movement. Although the immediate antagonist was French poetry – Provençal poetry commonly enjoyed higher status – given Lovato's loyalty to the *veterum vestigia vatum*, there can be no doubt that he considered Provençal poetry also inferior to Latin verse.[56] More generally, the letter indicates the creative tension between vernacular and Latin poetry at the dawn of humanism and injects an element of competition into the mixture of causes leading to the rise of a new Latin poetry around 1250. That Lovato should express his rivalry with vernacular poetry in such a way perhaps itself suggests the degree to which courtly manners had trickled down and become admixed with classical heroic ideals on the one hand and poetic expression on the other.

---

[55] Lovato, 2:97–98, in Sisler, *An Edition*, 42: "Despice, perpetiar; sedet haec sententia; persto/ More meo et longi vitium non corrigo morbi." The translation is found on 54.

[56] Kevin Brownlee, "The Practice of Cultural Authority: Italian Responses to French Cultural Dominance in *Il Tesoretto*, *Il Fiore*, and the *Commedia*," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 33 (1997): 258–69, has identified a similar sense of competition with French literary writings in these three major Italian works of the period. He shows how each, using the intertextual presence of the *Roman de la Rose*, undercuts the French authority while insisting on its own.

In his essay, "The Ethics of Literature: The *Fiore* and Medieval Traditions of Rewriting," in *The Fiore in Context: Dante, France, Tuscany*, ed. Zugmunt G. Baranski and Patrick Boyde (Notre Dame and London, 1994), 214, Baranski sees "an anti-French polemic" at the core of the *Fiore*, a Tuscan poem, frequently attributed to Dante. He argues that "the poet inevitably raises doubts about the accepted propriety and wisdom of proposing and taking France as an ethical and cultural model suitable for Tuscans to imitate." Even if the author was not Dante himself, nonetheless, like Dante, he was concerned with "the widespread presence of French culture in Italy" (217).

3

Although the diffusion of French and Provençal poetry, especially in the northern regions of Italy, prepared the way for the wealth of Latin poetic composition that began around 1250, it does not explain the classicizing tendencies shown by the group. The new cultural ideal was the product of the encounter between the recent appreciation of grammatical studies and the economic, political, and social conditions in northern and central Italy. While certain features of thirteenth-century Italian society encouraged the Italian upper classes to embrace the knightly ethos projected by French romance literature, other elements, equally native to northern and central Italian society, gave rise to different ethical and aesthetic goals.

The urban communes were the most dynamic forces in northern and central Italy. Released from imperial pressure in 1183, many of the communes found themselves torn by intense social conflict. While urban wars were more intense in the north of the peninsula, central Italy was not immune to them. The efforts of Frederick II to establish imperial hegemony north of Rome from the 1220s until his death in 1250 temporarily limited the cities' freedom of action. Cities were forced to choose between pope and emperor, and local politics became caught up in the larger fight. Once the emperor had been removed, however, cities reverted to their own agendas, largely unhampered by the designs of the universal powers.

Although ruling families in the towns and cities often had strong rural ties, their urban experience proved decisive from the standpoint of livelihood and politics. Inside the walls of most communes, moreover, other social groups, whose orientation was almost strictly urban, enjoyed increasing importance in economic and political life. Urban settings were not congenial to the chivalric ethic. Its narrow bonds of loyalty and its commitment to warfare did not furnish positive support for the complicated interpersonal relationships that characterized the city's professional and private spheres. Potentially, at least, ancient society, as it was reflected in the literature and history of ancient Latin writers, provided a more pertinent model for political and social conduct.[57]

[57] At certain moments in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Italians had already demonstrated a keen awareness of their Roman origins. Robert L. Benson, "Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the*

Ancient society, like thirteenth-century Italian society, was urban and theoretically republican, with a relatively high degree of social mobility in its golden age.[58] Like the leaders of thirteenth-century Italian communes, ancient Roman aristocrats had large landholdings in the countryside where they spent considerable time, but their primary residences were in the city. Many Roman aristocrats had been active citizens deeply involved in running the Roman municipal government and the institutions by which Rome controlled its vast empire.[59] Italians of the thirteenth century were constantly reminded of their Roman heritage by the presence of the ruins upon and within which many of them dwelt. Many cities boasted local myths connecting their founding with a Roman or other ancient hero. Lovato's own identification (ca. 1283) of the newly discovered tomb in the Paduan cathedral as that of Antenor, the mythical Trojan founder of Padua, did more than gratify popular curiosity. The status of Italian communes in thirteenth-century public law remained contested and, when Lovato proved that the city's origins lay in the ancient past, Paduan communal society gained legitimacy.[60]

Of all the cultures formerly ruled by ancient Rome, moreover, the Italians' was perhaps most like the Romans' in valuing and promoting rhetorical thinking. The differing fate of dialectic in medieval France and Italy provides evidence of the enduring hold that

Twelfth Century, 339–86, discusses the intensified consciousness of ancient Rome reflected in the revolt of the city against the papacy in the 1140s and 1150s and in the debates concerning the emperor's authority occasioned by the presence of Frederick I in Italy in the 1150s and 1160s. Pisa was particularly precocious in having a sense of its *Romanitas*: see Giuseppe Scalia, "Il carme pisana sull'impresa contro i Saraceni del 1087," in *Studi di filologia romanza offerti a Silvio Pellegrini* (Padua, 1971), 565–627; and his "'Romanitas' pisana tra XI e XII secolo: Le iscrizioni romane del duomo e la statua del console Rodolfo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 13 (1972): 791–843. See also Craig B. Fisher, "The Pisan Clergy and an Awakening of Historical Interest in a Medieval Commune," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 3 (1966): 141–219.

[58] Historians of Rome include Sulla's and Caesar's policy of introducing new men into the Roman senate in large numbers and the massive extinction of noble houses among the explanations for rapid social change in Roman society in the late republican and early imperial periods. See, for example, Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1966), 78–96 and 490–508; and Erich S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), 500–01.

[59] Jones, *The Italian City-State*, 5–54, skillfully outlines the similarities and differences between the relationship of town and country in ancient culture and in the Middle Ages, first in northern Europe, and then in northern and central Italy.

[60] Roberto Weiss, "Lovato dei Lovati (1241–1309)," *Italian Studies* 6 (1951): 8.

Ciceronian rhetoric as a form of logic held on the Italian mind.[61] Law was the leading intellectual discipline in Italian society; Italians felt comfortable with arguments of verisimilitude and proofs by inference, the usual techniques of reasoned persuasion in the world of practical affairs. Italians were, therefore, disposed to appreciate the ancient Roman mentality, and, as they began to reabsorb classical writings, they were better equipped than other Europeans to grasp the particular formation of the ancient Romans' phrases and thoughts.

Italians had been making a systematic effort since the early eleventh century to interpret the political and social institutions of their society within the context of ancient Roman law. While scholars made concessions to local customs and statutes, they also used the Justinian corpus because it offered (1) a model of organization for a legal system; (2) a set of basic principles for guaranteeing justice; and (3) a vast reservoir of concepts for analyzing human interactions and extending the law to cover them. Legal scholars approached ancient law pragmatically. In order to make sense of particular passages in Justinian, they often needed to grasp the ancient historical context, but their primary goal was to construct a just legal system for their own society. At least a century before humanists were aggressively reclaiming Italy's ancient Roman heritage, Roman lawyers, simply assuming that the two societies were similar, were aiming to fashion contemporary public and private law on the Justinian model.

From the beginning of the twelfth century, Roman law was the most important intellectual discipline in northern and central Italy, and it was a lay profession. Admittedly, the other two disciplines in which Italy led the rest of western Europe were canon law and *ars dictaminis*, and clerics predominated in the former while sharing the field with laymen in the latter. Still, the importance of laymen as

[61] Gerhard Otte, *Dialektik und Jurisprudenz: Untersuchungen zur Methode der Glossatoren* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1971), 17–32, provides citations from Roman lawyers, beginning with Irnerius, to prove their knowledge of dialetic. I have found no references in twelfth-century sources to indicate that dialectic was being taught formally, apart from legal instruction. To my knowledge, the only mention of a professional dialectician is in 1140 (see above, 15, n. 33) By the 1220s, however, when Bene da Firenze was composing his *Candelabrum*, dialectic had become a separate course of study, that is, if we are to take as factual the statement included in one of Bene's sample letters: "Sciatis quod Bononie gramatiam tribus annis audivi, biennio in logica laboravi, tandem in iure canonico sum titulum magisterii consecutus" (ibid., 219). For the date of the *Candelabrum*, see ibid., xxix–xxx.

scholars set Italy apart from the rest of Europe and constituted another bond between thirteenth-century Italy and ancient Rome. It is, therefore, not surprising that, with the revival of interest in grammatical studies in the late twelfth century, a layman was the first to seize on the relevance of the ancient Roman urban experience as a model for his own time. His study of Seneca opened up that experience to him.

A harbinger of the future humanist movement, Albertano da Brescia (ca. 1200–ca. 1270) was a judge and notary who combined his passion for scholarship and writing with a devotion to communal politics.[62] Albertano contributed significantly to the development of a model of the learned layman, which would be embraced by the early humanists of Padua with patriotic fervor. He had relatively wide knowledge of prose writers: besides being acquainted with a range of Christian authors, including Augustine, Cassiodorus, Alcuin, and Martin of Braga, he frequently quoted Cicero and, more importantly, Seneca. He was among the first Italians to reflect the influence of Seneca in his work.[63]

[62] Despite Aldo Checchini's effort to prove Albertano studied law at Bologna, the evidence is inconclusive: "Un giudice del secolo decimoterzo: Albertano da Brescia," *Atti del reale Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere, ed arti* 71 (1911–12): 1423–96. Checchini cites documents of 1226 and 1231, referring to Albertano as *iudex* (1424–25), while several times Albertano referred to himself as *causidicus*. Johannes Fried, *Die Entstehung des Juristenstandes im 12. Jahrhundert: Zur sozialen Stellung und politischen Bedeutung gelehrten Juristen in Bologna und Modena*, Forschungen zur neuren Privatrechtsgeschichte, no. 21 (Cologne, 1974), 42–44, indicates the difficulty of clearly separating *causidici* from *judices* in the documents. The terms are often interchangeable. Albertano was clearly a notary and perhaps had done some further study without taking his doctorate, which would have allowed him to teach law.

[63] On Seneca's influence on Albertano, see Powell, *Albertanus*, 9–44, and for his knowledge of Seneca's works, Klaus-Dieter Nothdurft, *Studien zum Einfluß Senecas auf die Philosophie und Theologie des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Leiden and Cologne, 1963), esp. 126–33. Albertano's knowledge of the ancient poets was less extensive. For references to ancient poets as well as prose writers, see index in ibid., 143–47. Henry of Settimello used several of Seneca's works in his *Elegia*: *Elegia*, ed. Giovanni Cremaschi (Bergamo, 1949), 37 and 41. Cf. Max Manitius and P. Lehmann, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911–31), 3:938. Without identifying it as Italian in origin, Carlo Pascal, *Letteratura latina medievale: Nuovi saggi e note critiche* (Catania, 1909), 143–49, describes a thirteenth-century manuscript in the BAM, O, 60 sup., containing proverbs drawing on Seneca. On 150–54, Pascal publishes a series of twelfth-century glosses on a late ninth- or early tenth-century manuscript, in Lombard script, of Seneca's *Dialogi*. Munk Olsen, *L'Etude des auteurs classiques latins*, vol. 2, gives manuscripts from twelfth-century Italy that include writings by Seneca or fragments. He gives four for the first half of the century (2: 429 [Munk Olsen no. 145], 2:444 [Munk Olsen no. 187], 2:449 [Munk Olsen no. 206], and 2:454 [Munk

From the mid-twelfth century onward, Seneca's philosophical writings had skyrocketed in popularity in France, but until Albertano, they had remained almost entirely neglected in Italy.[64] A devout thinker, Albertano found Seneca's moral tracts and especially his *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium* ideal for reinforcing the Christian message in his own writings. Christianity needed the eloquence and wisdom of one who, although not a Christian, had thought profoundly and piously on issues related to proper human conduct. By the early fourteenth century, Albertano's works, supplemented by those of later thirteenth-century authors under his influence, such as Brunetto Latini and the anonymous writer of the *Fior di virtù*, would make Seneca the most important pagan source for Italian laymen concerned with moral questions.[65] Lovato's reunion of Seneca *moralis* with Seneca *tragicus* would add another dimension to Seneca's appeal.

Boncompagno's short moral treatises, *Amicitia* and *De malo et senio*, were perhaps the earliest predecessors in Italy of Albertano's moralizing prose. Both treatises were products of Boncompagno's rivalry with Cicero's *De amicitia* and *De senectute*. Boncompagno's *Amicitia*, with its twenty-three definitions of friendship, was basically a *tour de force*; his *De malo et senio* was a collection of pessimistic autobiographical observations on old age, with little didactic value. Neither work spoke to the widespread factional warfare threatening to destroy contemporary communal society.

The earliest direct effort to provide moral guidance for communal life came from the *Oculus pastoralis*, composed by an anonymous author about 1222.[66] The work was not a moral treatise but rather a

---

Olsen no. 220]), and 7 for the second half (2:388 [Munk Olsen no. 22], 2:404 [Munk Olsen no. 69], 2:405 [Munk Olsen no. 70], 2:422 [Munk Olsen no. 124], 2:423 [Munk Olsen no. 125], 2:449 [Munk Olsen no. 205], 2:455–56 [Munk Olsen no. 223]). This compares with 26 and 92 for France in the same periods. He does not, however, mention the Ambrosiana manuscript referred to by Pascal.

[64] Evidence for this will be found in my forthcoming volume on medieval Italian culture.

[65] Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 121–27, discusses some of the authors influenced by Albertano.

[66] Part of the *Oculus* was published as *Trattato sopra l'uffizio del podestà: Scrittura inedita del buon secolo*, ed. P. Ferrato (Padua, 1865). Subsequently, P. Misciattelli published the work under the title *Trattato sull'ufficio del podestà (da un codice del Sec. XV)* (Siena, 1925), and Dora Franceschi published it in "*Oculus pastoralis pascens officia et continens radium dulcibus pomis suis*," *Memorie dell'Accademia delle scienze di Torino*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, 4th ser., 21 (1966): 23–74. She provided a detailed analysis of the work and an edition of an early vernacular translation in "*L'Oculus pastoralis* e la sua fortuna," *Atti dell'Accademia delle scienze di Torino*, cl. sci. mor., stor. e

manual designed primarily to provide models for speeches and letters used by *podestà*. Many of the model speeches, however, did outline the standards of conduct that a good *podestà* should follow. The author repeatedly urged officials to remain above the battle of factions and to administer justice equally to all comers. In its final pages, the figure of *Justitia* inveighed against the vices of *podestà* and implored God to direct the steps of communal officials in His ways.[67] There was nothing systematic in the work, nor did later examples of the genre go beyond the fragmentary moral counsel found here. The admonitions of the manuals appeared to be products of experience, commonsense conclusions independent of any literary or philosophical tradition.

Albertano's writings were of a different order. His achievement was to articulate a broad program for Christian citizens, who were increasingly conscious of the need for moral regeneration in their cities. Probably inspired by Seneca, although heavily indebted to Augustine and other Christian authors, his *De amore et dilectione Dei et proximi et aliarum rerum et de forma vitae* (1238) endeavored to develop a rule by which people would live in love of God and their neighbors, while leading fulfilling lives as members of a civil society.[68]

Confraternal statutes usually forbade the bearing of arms or the taking of oaths and imposed strict limitations on members' dress and consumption of food. Albertano instead advocated just warfare, self-defense, oath-taking – suggesting oaths' value as instruments of communal organization – as well as "moderation" in food and dress.[69] In a sermon of 1243 to a group of Genoese notaries and *causidici*,[70]

filol., 99, pt. 1 (1964–65): 205–61. The most accurate edition of the work is found in Terence Tunberg's Ph.D. dissertation, "*Oculus pastoralis*," University of Toronto, 1987. Turnberg has also edited the speeches from the work: *Speeches from the Oculus pastoralis* (Toronto, 1990).

[67] Franceschi, "Oculus pastoralis," 66–70. On the official focus of the *Oculus* and other manuals of the genre, consult Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (London and New York, 1978), 1:33–35.

[68] "This is a society, I say, in which all things that men consider worthy of pursuit are present: honor, glory, peace, and joy; when these are present there is happiness." Cited by Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 49, from Sharon Hiltz, "*De amore et dilectione Dei et proximi e aliarum rerum et de forma vitae*: An Edition," Ph.D. Diss, University of Pennsylvania, 1980), 102 (not seen). The *De amore et dilectione Dei* provided a rule of life akin to that used by lay confraternities of the period, but better adapted to the daily life of the citizen. The translation is in Powell.

[69] Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 47–48.

[70] Brownlee, "The Practice of Cultural Authority," 264.

Albertano stressed the obligation of notaries and lawyers to give advice and assistance to those seeking the benefit of their legal wisdom, which he defined as "knowledge of the perfect good of the human mind and of divine and human affairs."[71] Albertano believed that these professionals, from among whom communal officials were normally chosen, had a special status akin to that of priests and a responsibility to behave honestly and according to reason. They were "the salt of the earth."[72]

Albertano's *Liber consolationis et consilii* (1246) stands out among his other works for its focus on the vendetta, the main disrupter of communal life.[73] A dialogue between Melibeus and his wife Prudentia, the work confronted the natural desire of men to avenge themselves against those who had wronged them. Melibeus, a rich man but not a member of the urban aristocracy, had seen his daughter injured and his home invaded by a band of aristocrats. In the course of a long interchange between them, Prudentia convinced Melibeus of the impracticality and irrationality of seeking vengeance. If the malefactors were to be punished, the task fell to the official judge, not the private person.[74] Urging reconciliation, she prevailed on the guilty men to seek Melibeus's pardon. With the approval of the supporters he had called in to consult with him on the problem, Melibeus accepted the malefactors' confession and granted them forgiveness.

Viewed as a corpus, Albertano's writing constituted a counterweight to the chivalric ideal, whose principal accent fell on personal honor. He appears to have been the first postclassical Italian to conceive of a distinctive urban morality, one in which the individual's highest goal on earth was the peaceful enjoyment of life within an urban context. Whereas the chivalric ethos fed the bitter urban rivalries characteristic of the thirteenth century, Albertano's urban morality, couched in a Christian framework, strove for reconciliation and cooperation.

In each of his writings, Albertano relied heavily on pagan authors, reinforcing his own words with streams of quotations from their works as well as from the Bible and Christian authors. He made no

[71] Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 58.

[72] Ibid., 58 and 60.

[73] I have used the edition of the work edited by Thor Sundby: *Albertani brixiensis: Liber consolationis et consilii* (Copenhagen and London, 1873).

[74] Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 86–89.

reference, however, to the context in which his ancient sources were writing. By the same token, the fact that the ancient authors, especially Seneca and Cicero, inspired him to evolve a new moral program for his contemporaries suggests that he must have sensed something of a similarity between his and their societies, for otherwise, he would not have considered it appropriate to cite them.

Albertano's writings exerted a strong influence on Italian vernacular literature. They inspired the author of the *Fior di virtù* and Brunetto Latini, both of whom, if less self-consciously Christian, imitated Albertano's blending of pagan and Christian authors to provide moral instruction for laymen.[75] Latini, however, would be more aware than Albertano of the relevance of the ancient experience to contemporary life and would have a deeper appreciation of the ancient context in which the pagan authors had written.[76]

About 1300, in his completion of Thomas Aquinas's unfinished *De regimine principum*, Ptolemy of Lucca, a scholastic thinker resident in Santa Maria Novella, the house of the Dominican order in Florence, made explicit the parallels between Rome and contemporary Italy that had been only implicit in Albertano's work.[77] The republican modifications that Ptolemy added to the monarchical thrust of the

[75] Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 116–17 and 122–23. Scaglione, *Knights at Court*, 181–82, uses Latini's *Tesoretto* to illustrate the influence of the courtly tradition in Italy. Nonetheless, the overwhelming direction of Latini's thought was to establish a civic morality for his fellow Florentines: John Najemy, "Brunetto Latini's 'Politica,'" *Dante Studies* 112 (1994): 33–51. Cf. Lauro Martines, *Power and Imagination: City-States in Renaissance Italy* (New York, 1980), 123: "Whatever he [Latini] took from the intellectual tradition, from Aristotle, Cicero, or St. Augustine, he envisaged in the context of a walled city with grave social and political tensions .... He felt that citizens owe a supreme debt to their city, which had provided them with the amenities of civilized living. The feeling amounted to a full-blown patriotism." But in support of Scaglione, see my remarks on Latini in ch. 5.

[76] Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia*, 121–26.

[77] Like his master Aquinas, Ptolemy reflected in his writings the intellectual excitement generated among scholastic scholars since the 1260s by contact with new translations of Aristotle's political and ethical works. See Charles T. Davis, "Roman Patriotism and Republican Propaganda: Ptolemy of Lucca and Pope Nicolas III," and "Ptolemy of Lucca and the Roman Republic," in his *Dante's Italy and Other Essays* (Philadelphia, 1984), 224–53 and 254–89. On what Ptolemy and the Scholastics thought about Italian communal government and the advantages of republican versus princely government, see as well Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 77–79; Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:49–65; John H. Mundy, "In Praise of Italy: The Italian Republics," *Speculum* 64 (1989): 815–34; and James Blythe, *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1992), 92–117.

earlier chapters by Aquinas showed Ptolemy's awareness of the distinctive character of the Italian political experience and the appropriateness to it of Roman parallels.[78] At roughly the same time, the same

[78] Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 77–79; Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:52, 54–55, and 59. Although Ptolemy deserves to be regarded as the first republican theorist in European history, nonetheless he at points obfuscates his otherwise clear distinction between *principatus despoticus* and *principatus politicus* and does not offer an unambiguous republican interpretation of ancient Roman history (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 78). In the introduction to his English translation of Ptolemy's part of the *De regimine principum*, *On the Government of Rulers: De regimine principum* (Philadelphia, 1997), 7, James Blythe attributes to me a view that I have never held, viz., that Aquinas was a republican. His remarks are based on my article "The Rebirth of the Concept of Republican Liberty in Italy," in *Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, ed. Anthony Molho and John A. Tedeschi (Dekalb, 1971), 193–94. Blythe has misinterpreted the point that I was trying to make about the importance of *De regimine principum*, I.4, where Thomas states that men are more interested in the common welfare when no one person has power over the public interest. Thomas then applies this general principle to the Roman state and concludes that when Rome fell under the power of the emperors, most of whom were tyrants, it was ultimately reduced to nothing. I stated (p. 193) that this was "the only statement I have so far found in medieval literature which is unmistakably republican in its criticism of the Emperors as a group and which provides a rationale for the putative superiority of republicanism over monarchy." I meant only to point out that the content of the statement, taken in isolation, expressed a republican idea, not that Thomas himself ever espoused a republican position.

In replying to what he takes to be my reading of Aquinas, Blythe succinctly expresses what has been my reading all along: "... in a discussion of why monarchy is best, he [Aquinas] pauses to discuss how tyranny is the worst. To this end, he shows how the Romans were able to advance under a republic once they had expelled tyrannical kings. But he is equally at pains to point out the dangers of republican government: the Roman Republic collapsed in civil wars" (*On the Government of Rulers*, 7). For Salutati's use of Aquinas's condemnation of the emperors in a republican context, see Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 54.

In *Foundations*, 31–35, Skinner traces the formulation of a republican ideology back into the early thirteenth century. In his "Pre-humanist Origins of Republican Ideas," in *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, ed. G. Bock, Q. Skinner, and M. Viroli (Cambridge and New York, 1990), 122, Skinner traces it back to the early twelfth century in Italy. If by "ideology" he means a theoretical statement regarding the value of republicanism, none of the examples he offers before Latini has a theoretical character. For qualification of Latini's "theory" as well, see below, 207. Philip Jones, *The Italian City-States*, 460, clearly describes the level of political awareness in medieval Italy: "Doubly inspired by present experience and antique tradition, Ciceronian and Aristotelian, the communes contributed powerfully in fact to the rebirth in Europe of systematic, and more especially republican, political science .... For long, however, this reborn civic ethic and republican ideology was more implied than stated, indicated in political action, gesture, and cliché. It was embodied in the terminology of politics, starting with the word 'commune' itself, in the constitutional and legal system and cult of *iustitia*, and in the aims of public education. It was evoked in the rhetoric of the Lombard and later leagues of liberty, in claims to innate or primitive freedom, and in growing appeals to *amor patrie*, even in private deeds. It was sug-

themes would be echoed by another Dominican, the popular preacher Girolamo dei Remigi (d. 1317), who became the most powerful proponent of an urban–civic ethic in Florence in the early decades of the fourteenth century.[79]

As subsequent chapters will suggest, the awareness of the need to create a morality geared to urban life profoundly marked early humanism. Increasingly throughout the fourteenth century, the humanists, who often exaggerated the similarities between ancient and contemporary cultures in their writings, sought to reform their own society using ancient models. Evolving economic, social, and political realities in the Italian city-states heightened their appreciation of the peculiar character of communal society, in contrast to the rest of Italy and Europe. The urban ethical model, whether in republican or monarchical dress, struggled against the chivalric one for domination

---

gested in stray maxims, common tags, and conventional principles – *quod omnes tangit* and the like – enunciated in statutes, council debates, or the *parlamenti* of *podestà*. And most particularly it was represented in communal mythology, ritual, and iconography."

Numerous examples of "republican ideology" offered by Skinner do not even seem to me to demonstrate a republican tendency. For example, he frames his analysis of the "republican ideology" found in thirteenth-century treatises containing speeches to be given by incoming or outgoing *podestà* as follows: "These writers are all fully committed to the view that the best form of constitution for a *commune* or *civitas* must be of an elective as opposed to a monarchical character. If a city is to have any hope of attaining its highest goals, it is indispensable that its administration should remain in the hands of officials whose conduct can in turn be regulated by established customs and laws" ("Pre-humanist Origins," 125). But there is nothing in the examples he gives to suggest anything like this view. For example, a model speech of Giovanni da Vignano "for outgoing *podestà* bids them express the hope that the city they have been administering 'will at all times grow and increase,' above all in prosperity" (ibid., 126). In his manual, Guido Faba advises these officials "to promise 'to do whatever may be necessary for the maintenance of the standing and the *graneça* of the commune, and for the increase of the honour and glory of those friendly to it'" (ibid., 127). Subsequently, Skinner provides statements from these treatises insisting strongly on the *podestà*'s duty to preserve justice in the commune. For example, "Giovanni da Viterbo begins his treatise by laying down that the prime duty of chief magistrates is 'to render to each person his due, in order that the city may be governed in justice and equity'" (ibid., 131). Or again on justice: "'He who loves justice,' Matteo de' Libri proclaims, 'loves a constant and perpetual will to give to each his right, and he who loves to give to each his right loves tranquillity and repose, by means of which countries rise to the highest *grandeça*'" (ibid., 132). It is certainly possible to argue, as Skinner does, that in order for such justice to be achieved, the city would have to be a republic, but the manuals do not make that argument.

[79] Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 77; Skinner, *Foundations*, 52 and 55–59; Martines, *Power and Imagination*, 126–28.

of Italian society throughout the Renaissance. The humanists never mentioned their rival's name: adherence to ancient models of diction meant it was literally impossible to discuss *cortesia* in their Latin. Nonetheless, the hold of the courtly ideal on the conscience of Italians and other Latin Christians remained strong down through the centuries. One might say that the battle ended only with the victory of the humanists' model in the aftermath of the French Revolution.[80]

4

The thirteenth-century Italian revival of interest in ancient literature had a greater reforming effect on Italian intellectual life than the corresponding revival in France in the previous century had had on intellectual life there. For Latin literature to affect medieval French culture, it had had to be domesticated within a monarchical and rural society whose intellectuals were clerics. A few twelfth-century writers may have discovered the stylistic keys to imitating the pagan writers, but for the Frenchmen, classicizing poetry was only one genre among several in which they wrote. The highly urbanized republican world of northern and central Italy was, through its own experience, better fitted to absorb ancient culture and identify with it. By 1250, renewed contact with ancient authors had inspired a lay intellectual to formulate a new urban morality. Over subsequent decades, Italians' sense of a special filial relationship to the superior culture of *Romanitas* intensified. Italy's privileged link with ancient Rome later provided the foundation for Petrarch's stance in his quarrels with the Francophiles at Avignon.

That, then, was the background against which, around 1290, Lovato dei Lovati affirmed his intention to follow in "the footsteps of the ancient poets" – a principle that conditioned his whole approach to antiquity. Lovato's poetry, written in a remarkably classicizing style, had begun to appear in the 1260s, the same decade in which Latini was using Cicero and Aristotle in his *Tresor* to help him understand Florentine government and in which he was also initiating a series of Tuscan translations of Cicero's work. The contrast between

[80] Scaglione, *Knights at Court*, traces this concept of chivalry through the early modern period.

Florence and Padua was stark: in Florence, Latini and his immediate successors generally chose their native Tuscan vernacular for exploiting the ancient heritage, while in Padua, Lovato and his disciples elected to exploit the ancient heritage in its own tongue.

When it came to classicizing, Italian poets in northern and central Italy enjoyed an advantage over their counterparts north of the Alps. Once having decided to embrace classical standards of style in their compositions, the Italians, unlike the French, were not constrained by a domestic poetic tradition. Little Latin poetry had been written during the previous century-and-a-half in Italy. Although the works of French Latin poets circulated in Italy, Italians were free to follow or ignore them as they chose.

Of the Latin poems of the six major poets whose works appeared between roughly 1245 and the end of the century (Urso da Genova, Stefanardo da Vimercate, Lovato dei Lovati, Bonifacio of Verona, Bellino Bissolo, and Bonvesin de la Riva), those of Bellino and Bonvesin appear at first glance to have no classicizing pretensions.[81] Sharing a common didactic aim, both authors show a preference for formulating precepts and aphorisms in successions of unimaginative elegiac verses, relying on a vocabulary sometimes corrupted by neologisms from Italian dialects. A study of the metric structure of their poetry together with that of the other four poets, however, indicates that with differences, all were endeavoring to follow a more classical prosody than that used by Italian poets of the region in the previous century.

---

[81] I have not included in my survey Orfino of Lodi's *De regimine et sapientia potestatis*, edited by Antonio Ceruti in *Miscellanea di storia italiana*, vol. 7 (Turin, 1869), 33–94, or the closely related *De laude civitatis Laudae*, ed. C. Pertz, *MGH*, *Scriptores*, 22 (Hannover, 1872), 372–73, by an anonymous author (the edition of A. Caretta [Lodi, 1962] was not available to me). Orfino's work is a manual for *podestà* composed while the author was in the service of Frederick of Antioch, imperial vicar of the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona and of the Romagna (*De regimine*, 94, n. 3). Frederick held the office between 1246 and 1250. For the dating and summary of the poem, see Fritz Hertter, *Die Podestàliteratur Italiens im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1910; rpt. Hildesheim, 1973), 75–79. The second poem can be dated to the 1250s (J.K. Hyde, "Medieval Descriptions of Cities," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48 [1965]: 340) and is heavily influenced in its style by Orfino, whom the author mentions twice in the course of the short poem (373, lines 58 and 73). Written in medieval leonine verse, neither poem is relevant for my analysis. In leonine verse the word preceding the caesura in both hexameter and pentameter rhymes with the final word. The basic study of *leonitas* remains Carl Erdmann, "*Leonitas*," in *Corona quernea: Festgabe für Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1941), 15–28.

Understanding the norms of prosody in the northern European medieval tradition helps in the interpretation of the distinctive characteristics of Italian metric practices. At least by the twelfth century, while the sense of the quantitative values of words remained strong, the mainstream of French Latin poetry unambiguously rejected elision, which was frequent in ancient poetry.[82] In writing dactylic hexameter, northern poets had no compunction about ending a word on the first syllable of the fifth foot, creating a caesura (or word break within a metrical foot), so that a block of four syllables, whether a single word or a word grouping, fell at the end of the line. Ancient practice tolerated this practice if a monosyllable preceded the four-syllabic grouping, but medieval poets frequently formed the fifth foot in other ways. Whereas ancient poets preferred words of three syllables or less, medieval poets commonly employed longer words.[83] The classicizing French poets composed poetry replete with elisions and religiously avoided the fifth-foot caesura, but as Valerius's preface to his *Bucolica* indicates, even the few who mastered the ancient rules readily followed contemporary tastes when it suited them.

Until the 1190s, northern and central Italian poets appeared just as uninfluenced by northern European rules of meter as they were by other aspects of northern poetic innovation. For instance, the anonymous author of the most classicizing Latin poem by a northern or central Italian in the pre-1190 period, the *Carmen de gestis Frederici I*, written about 1165, included seven elisions (3.5 per cent) in his two hundred opening lines. All the same, the work was not consistently classical in its meter, since three (1.5 per cent of the total) of nine line endings in four-syllable words or groups of words (4.5 per cent) were

[82] Klopsch, *Einführung*, 79–87; Martin, "Classicism and Style," 561–62; and Giovanni Orlandi, "Caratteri della versificazione dattilica," in *Retorica e poetica tra i secoli XII e XIV: Atti del secondo Convegno internazionale di studi dell'Associazione per il Medioevo e l'Umanesimo latini in onore e memoria di Ezio Francheschini, Trento e Rovereto, 3-5 ottobre 1986*, ed. C. Leonardi and E. Menesto (Perugia, 1988), 157–58. Martin (561) defines and illustrates elision as follows: "Elision is the suppression of a final vowel, or a vowel plus *m*, before another vowel (or *h*) beginning the next word, as in this hexameter written by Hildebert: 'res homin(um) atqu(e) homines levis alea versat in horas.'"

[83] Klopsch, *Einführung*, 65–76; Martin, "Classicism and Style," 62–63; and Orlandi, "Caratteri," 153–57 and 158–63. The fifth-foot caesura and the long words in the final feet give an anapestic rise to the line ending, in contrast with the classical line, which descends from the fourth foot to the end: see Orlandi, "Caratteri," 154–55.

not redeemed by a preceding monosyllable.[84] The author also had fourteen lines ending in five-syllable words.[85]

The metric of Henry of Settimello's *Elegia*, written in 1192 or 1193, was the first to manifest the effects of the new French literary influence. Loyalty to the French "modern" school of mannerism betrays itself not only in the excessive use of *colores rhetorici* but also in the prosody.[86] An analysis of a block of the first two hundred dactylic lines in the elegiac verses shows that, while only two (1.0 per cent) of eleven lines ending in four-syllable groups (5.5 per cent) did not have a monosyllable in the preceding position, Henry used elision in his dactylic hexameters in only three cases (1.5 per cent). Furthermore, the verses frequently contained five-syllable words, and five of those were at the end of verses. While the author of the *Carmen* may have deviated from classical verse techniques out of ignorance, Henry composed the *Elegia* with a deliberate artfulness that declared his allegiance to modern poetics.

A survey of the metric of Latin poems written in the mid-thirteenth century indicates that a change had taken place. Even if their poetry seems medieval in some respects, most of the poets in this group appear to be emulating ancient models in their metrics. In some cases, moreover, where early and later poems of the same poets exist, a development toward a more classical poetry is discernible.

While markedly classicizing in other ways, the earliest of the poems, Urso da Genova's *De victoria quam Genuenses ex Friderico II retulerunt*

---

[84] For example, the anonymous author of the *Carmen* writes: "Osten/dant ser/vire su/o domin/o veni/enti": *Carmen de gestis Frederici I imperatoris in Lombardia*, ed. Irene Schmale-Ott, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (Hannover, 1965), 4, line 82. For correction of the text, see J.B. Hall, "The *Carmen de gestis Frederici imperatoris in Lombardia*," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 26 (1985): 969–76. The work was earlier edited by Ernesto Monaci, the poem's discoverer: *Gesta di Federico I in Italia*, FSI, no. 1 (Rome, 1887). I have based my statistics on Schmale-Ott's edition. Although the caesura after the first syllable of the fifth foot of the dactyl was relatively infrequent in most classical poets, the ancients would have permitted "Auderet contra committere, nam timor omnes" (ibid., 4, line 32). Virgil employs the last form in 1.2 per cent of his endings; Ovid and Lucan both in 0.3 per cent. In late Latin poets the usage also remains low, e.g., Fortunatus at 0.2 per cent. Horace in his *Epistles*, however, uses it in 7.6 per cent of his line endings: Jean Soubiran, "Prosodie et métrique des 'Bella parisiae urbis' d'Abbon," *Journal des Savants* 300 (1965): 286.

[85] Finding the words *Medio/lanum*, *Medio/lani* and *Medio/lano* attractive for covering the last two feet of the dactyl, the author used the words terminally five times, four times, and once respectively.

[86] The *Elegia* was published by Giovanni Cremaschi (Bergamo, 1949).

(ca. 1245), reveals conflicting tendencies in its prosody. Four five-syllable words occur in 200 lines, with none in the final position, and only five of the lines end with a caesura in the fifth foot (2.5 per cent), of which only one does not have a preceding monosyllable (0.5 per cent). The fact that Urso admits no elisions, however, indicates his continued adherence to medieval prosody.[87]

By contrast, the two major works of Stefanardo da Vimercate, *Liber de gestis in civitate mediolanensi* and *De controversia hominis et fortunae*, the first probably written in 1261/65 and the second after 1277, unambiguously reflect classical imitation. In Stefanardo's two works, there are no examples of a fifth-foot caesura, and elision represents 6 per cent and 9 per cent of the lines respectively.[88] Similarly, there is no fifth-foot caesura in Bonifacio of Verona's *Annayde* (1245/72) or in his *Eulistea* (1293), and the rate of elision climbs from 9.5 per cent in the earlier poem to 13 per cent in the latter.[89]

Even though he was less classical in his prosody than either Stefanardo or Bonifacio, Bonvesin de la Riva (before 1250–ca. 1315) made technical progress in a classical direction – that is assuming

[87] *De victoria quam Genuenses ex Friderico II retulerunt* was published twice, first by T. Vallauri, in *Historiae patriae monumenta*, vol. 6 (Chartarum, 2) (Turin, 1853), 1741–64, and then by Giovanni B. Graziano, *Vittoria de' Genovesi supra l'armata di Federico II: Carme di Ursone notaio del secolo XIII* (Genoa, 1857).

The statistics are taken from Orlandi, "Carateri della versificazione," 169, and are based on 200 lines.

[88] Stefanardo's *De controversia hominis et fortunae*, ed G. Cremaschi (Milan, 1950), was written between 1261 and 1266 and his *Liber de gestis in civitate mediolanensi*, ed. G. Calligaris, *RIS*, new ser., 9.1 (Città di Castello, 1912), was written a little after 1277 (G. Cremaschi, *Stefanardo da Vimercate: Contributo per la storia della cultura in Lombardia nel sec. XIII* [Milan, 1950], 20 and 67). The statistics are taken from Orlandi, "Caratteri della versicazione," 169, and are based on the whole texts.

[89] The *Annayde* is published in part by C.M. Piastra, "Nota sull'*Annayde* di Bonifacio veronese," *Aevum* 28 (1954): 505–19. See 506 for dating. Large portions of the *Eulistea* are published by F. Bonaini, A. Fabretti, and F. Polidori as *De rebus a Perusinis gestis ann. MCL–MCCXCIII: Historia metrica quae vocatur Eulistea*, in *Archivio storico italiano* 16 (1850): 3–52. The nineteenth-century edition of the *Eulistea* is incomplete. Whole passages of the original text are unintelligible. For the dating of the original work, see G. Arnaldi, "Bonifacio veronese," *DBI* 12 (1970), 191. Much of a third work, *Veronica*, is also published by C.M. Piastra, "Nota sulla *Veronica* di Bonifacio veronese," *Aevum* 33 (1959): 356–81. The statistics are based on 200 lines of each text.

The difference between the "progress" in prosody found in earlier and later works of both Stefanardo and Bonifacio may be owing to the fact that in each case the later compositions are epics. The ancient resonances connected with the genre may have inspired greater use of elision. That would not apply, however, in the case of the comparison between Lovato's two poems.

that the difference in degree of classical imitation reflects the contrast between an earlier and a later work. His *De controversia mensium* has no elisions and a high percentage of final tetrasyllabic patterns (11.6 per cent). Lines in this group that are not redeemed by a preceding monosyllable constitute 1.9 per cent of those in the sample. By contrast, his *Vita scholastica* shows a more classical tendency. There are still no elisions, but only 1.5 per cent of the line endings have a tetrasyllabic pattern, and all those that do are preceded by a monosyllable.[90]

Similarly, if Bellino Bissolo's *Speculum vite* is in fact earlier than his *Liber legum moralium*, his progress was only slightly less marked than Bonvesin's. On the one hand, the *Speculum vite* has elisions in 1.0 per cent of the lines and, while 9.0 per cent of the line endings follow a tetrasyllabic pattern, the caesura fails to fall on a preceding monosyllable in only one case (0.5 per cent). On the other hand, Bellino's *Liber legum moralium* is more in line with ancient patterns. Although 1.0 per cent of the lines of a two-hundred-line sample contain elisions, as in the *Speculum*, only 1.4 per cent of the lines end in a tetrasyllabic pattern, and all have a monosyllable preceding the pattern.[91]

Lovato's evolution in imitating ancient prosody, like Stefanardo's and Bonifacio's, can be established by dated compositions. The third of Lovato's *Epistolae metricae*, composed in 1267 or 1268, consisting of 228 elegiac lines (114 hexameters) and the second composed ca. 1290, consisting of 107 hexameter lines, contain only one line ending each in the anciently accepted form of a monosyllable plus a tetrasyllabic word or word-pattern. The earlier letter, however, contains only 3.5 per cent elisions, compared with 11.2 per cent in the later one.[92]

---

[90] *De controversia mensium*, ed. G. Orlandi, "Letteratura e politica nei Carmina de mensibus (De controversia mensium) di Bonvesin de la Riva," in *Felix olim Lombardia: Studi di storia padana dedicati dagli allievi a Giuseppe Martini* (Milan, 1978), 103–96, and *Vita scholastica*, in *Quinque claves sapientiae*, ed. A. Vidmanova-Schmidtova (Leipzig, 1969), 41–69. Orlandi gives an approximate date for the work, "Letteratura e politica," 127–31. The statistics are taken from Orlandi, "Caratteri della versificazione," 169, and are based on an analysis of the whole texts.

[91] V. Licitra published the first work in "Il *Liber legum moralium* e il *De regimine vite et sanitatis* di Bellino Bissolo," in *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 6.2 (1965): 419–54; and the second in "Lo *Speculum vite* di Bellino Bissolo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 8 (1967): 1089–1146. The statistics are based on the whole text of both works.

[92] *Epist.* 3, is dated 1267–68 (Sisler, *An Edition*, 56–67), and *Epist.* 2, dated ca. 1290 (ibid., 38–43). For the dates of 3 and 2, see respectively C. Foligno, "Epistole inedite

At least at the level of prosody, then, Italian poets showed an increasing adherence to ancient precedent. Since only their prosody was affected by ancient norms, Bellino and Bonvesin do not seem to have been personally committed to the ancient ideal. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that they were at least touched by a classicizing current.[93] Bonifacio's metric is more classical than theirs, but in other respects his three surviving works give little indication that he was stylistically inspired by ancient authors.[94]

In contrast, the poems of the other three contemporary poets, Urso da Genova, Stefanardo da Vimercate, and Lovato dei Lovati, mark the advent of a new classicizing taste. Although Urso's prosody differs little from Henry of Settimello's fifty years before, Urso's epic *De victoria* is far more classicizing than the mannerist *Elegia* or Bonifacio's *Eulistea*, composed a half century later, despite the latter's stricter adherence to ancient metric. The *De victoria*, a continuation of

---

di Lovato de' Lovati e d'altri a lui," *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 45–46; and Guido Billanovich, "Lovato: L'epistola a Bellino," *IMU* 32 (1989): 101–10. For the relationship between Sisler's numbering of Lovato's letters and Foligno's, which has become standard (see below, 96, n. 42). See the same note for the dates of the letters.

[93] They cannot be called old-fashioned in an Italian context, because the kind of didactic poetry they wrote has no surviving Italian precedent north of Rome.

[94] Each dedicated to a cardinal of the Church, the *Annayde* and *Veronica* are religious poems. A work in praise of the Virgin Mary, *Annayde* draws heavily on scripture and contemporary science and philosophy. Based on the Apocrypha, *Veronica* celebrates the bringing of the Shroud of Christ from Palestine to Rome. Bonifacio borrowed more frequently from the classics in the later work than in the earlier. For a list of sources used in *Annayde*, see Piastra, "Note sull'*Annayde*," 519–21. For *Veronica*, see Piastra, "Nota sulla *Veronica*," 365–67.

Bonifacio appears to have been exiled from Verona by Ezzelino in 1253 and to have remained in exile until his death in 1293. Given its dedication to a French cardinal, Guillaume Bray, even Bonifacio's earliest work was probably written after his departure from Verona. He lived for some time at the court of Rudolph of Habsburg and spent at least the last year of his life in Perugia, where for fifty florins he composed a poetic epic honoring the city and for another fifty a prose version of the same. The details are found in Arnaldi, "Bonifacio," 191–92. The work of a hack, *Eulistea* is devoid of poetic value. Its classicizing prosody must be balanced against its frequent use of neologisms: F. Polidori, "Voci latino-barbare," *Archivio storico italiano* 16 (1850): cix–cxv. Bonaini calls Bonifacio an "improvvisatore" rather than a poet: F. Bonaini, "Prefazione," ibid., xix. Bonifacio's writings are significant only because they give yet another indication of the rebirth of Latin poetry in northern Italy.

I have not discussed Bonaiutus de Casentino here because all of his surviving poetry was written after 1290: Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Umanesimo e scolastica a Padova fino al Petrarca," *Medioevo* 11 (1985): 4. Bonaiutus's poetry, found in BAV, *Vat. Lat.*, 2854, shows a strong preference for leonine verse.

the narrow twelfth-century Italian tradition of patriotic epics, was designed to commemorate the victory of Genoa over a combined army under the command of Manfredo Lancia and Oberto Pelavicino, sent by Frederick II in the summer of 1242 to conquer the Ligurian city and bring it under Hohenstaufen control. The poem of l,064 lines in dactylic hexameter was probably written shortly after the event. It reflects the influence of classical models of epic poetry.

We know little of the life of Urso. He was a contemporary of Albertano and may have heard him when Albertano addressed the notaries of Genoa in 1243. Urso was listed as scribe of the *consul civitatis et burgi* in 1225, when he served as notary to the Genoese embassy, that traveled to Verona to notify Pecoraro da Mercatonuovo that he had been elected *podestà* of Genoa. After at least three years' employment as scribe – documentation of officeholders only begins in 1225 – Urso became scribe of the *consul palacii de medio* for at least three years (1232, 1233, and 1234) and *scriba communis* in 1239. During the same period, he may also have engaged in private practice as a notary.[95] That he was sometimes designated as *magister Urso notarius* suggests that, like his Genoese contemporary *magister Bartholomeus notarius*, he worked as a teacher of grammar or of the *ars notaria*.[96] In addition to his *De victoria*, he is credited with having composed a book of moral fables, but it has not survived. By his own

[95] The assignment to Verona is mentioned by Graziano, *De victoria*, v. Other official appointments are found in *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCII*, ed. L.T. Belgrado and Cesare Imperiale di Sant'Angelo, 5 vols. (Rome, 1890–1929), 3:3 (1225); 11 (1226); 17 (1227); 37 (1228); 62 (1232); 68 (1233); 70 (1234); and 92 (1239). Gabriella Airidi, *Le carte di Santa Maria delle Vigne di Genoa (1103–1392)* (Genoa, 1969), 139 and 142, records Urso as *sacri palatii notarius* writing a document for the church in 1233, and another as *magister Urso notarius* in 1234.

The *Cartolari notarili genovesi (1–149): Inventario*, vol. 1.1, ed. Marco Bologna, Pubblicazioni degli archivi di stato, no. 22 (Rome, 1956), 43–44, lists a series of notarial acts written by a *notaio Urso* from August 1224 to December 1229, apparently copied by his son *Federicus Ursi de Sigestro*. Because Federico himself wrote the documents in these years and would have been at least in his twenties, his father would have had to be born in the early 1180s at the latest. If the author Urso served on a ship in 1242, as I suggest in the text, he and Urso de Sigestro are probably not the same man. Vito Vitale, "Le fonti della storia medioevale genovese," *Storia di Genova dalle origini al tempo nostro*, ed. A.R. Scarsella, 3 vols. (Milan, 1941-42), 3:331, refers to an act written by Urso in 1223 and reports that he was active as late as 1258 (unfortunately, Vitale cites no sources for his remark). Nonetheless, this Urso might still have been too old to serve on a ship as the author apparently did.

[96] A. Giusti, "Lingua e letteratura latine in Liguria," in *Storia di Genova dalle origini* 2:333, with notes, 348.

admission averse to the sea ("Erue me pelago, tumidis defende procellis": line 774), he probably was among the seasick soldiers he described as being grateful for having finally come ashore (lines 750 ff.).

The *De victoria* suffers from the dramatic point of view because Urso was celebrating a war that had consisted of a series of military encounters with no central event to provide a focus. The naval battle, which might have served the purpose, amounted to an unsuccessful pursuit by the Genoese of their enemies, who hoisted sail and fled at first sight of the Genoese fleet. To enhance his account, the poet relied on classical techniques, coordinating natural events with military actions and indulging in elaborate description of the Ligurian countryside and of the personalities of the opposing leaders. Behind the thirty-four lines (31–64) describing the different peoples called to serve in Frederick's army stands Lucan's *Pharsalia* with its poetic listings.[97] Virgil seems the major source for Urso's descriptions of various times of day, such as dawn and twilight, which are designed to set the mood for depicting events; but liberal borrowings from Horace, Juvenal, and Ovid also contribute to the classicizing effect of the work.[98]

Not a first-rate poet – his metric was often mechanical and his imagery derivative – Urso exhibited originality in a few digressions, such as when he portrayed the enemy soldiers boasting in local taverns of the booty they would enjoy after their victory in the battle yet to be fought (lines 269–80), or when he described the advent of twilight:

> Jamque dies decimae cursus exegerat horae;
> Jam properante gradu vergebat ad aequora Phoebus,
> Nec remoratus equos laxis currebat habenis,
> Pronus in oceanum, subducens lumina terris.[99]

At such points Urso was confident enough of his technique to move outside the simple narration of the story to which twelfth-century Italian epic writers generally clung.

---

[97] *Pharsalia*, I, 422–63, and III, 173–298, provided examples of the technique. Among other listings in Urso, see lines 657–681.

[98] Graziano, *De victoria*, viii–xiv, provides examples.

[99] "Already at the tenth hour, the chariot had expelled the day./ Phoebus, in a hastening course, was turning now toward the sea;/ With no delay he drove the horses with the reins loose/ Straight into the ocean, drawing the light from the earth" (lines 179–182).

Urso's grasp of ancient Latin was insufficient, however, to keep him from occasionally making errors in quantities.[100] Neologisms in the text, like *protentinos* (line 697: standardbearers) and *paroma* (line 752: slipknotted rope), may be designed to give specificity, but others, such as *neronizans* (line 238: tyrannizing), *fossaria* (line 248: plowed fields?), and *depatriari* (line 853: to be exiled), cannot be justified on the same grounds.[101] At some points, Urso relied on syntactical constructions of nonclassical resonance, e.g., *docta nocere* (line 482) and *novus nocere* (line 487).[102] Nevertheless, Urso's work was inspired by a generic classical model of the epic. By skillfully "contaminating" his verse with ancient fragments from diverse pagan authors, he attained a degree of *vetustas* unmatched by any of his medieval Italian predecessors.[103]

---

[100] One suspects that the editor, faced with a defective manuscript copy, at points doctored the text to correct the meter. See the editor's justification for five dubious changes in the hundred lines 500–599: p. 103 (n. 69: line 510 and n. 71: line 527), p. 104 (n. 72: line 534); p. 105 (n. 75: line 559 and n. 76: line 578).

[101] The editor justifies the usage of the first two words as follows: "poichè a ben dipingere si ricerca il proprio e lo speciale della forma e dell'atto di questa sola cosa, e non d'altra, io penso aver egli anteposto il vocabolo nuovo all'antico, che gli offriva l'oggetto d'una maniera comune, o con qualche diversità, benchè leggiera, di tinta" (vi).

[102] In the manuscript, lines 480–88 read:

> Asperius post damna furit mens saeva tyranni,
> Semper inardescit, semper stimulatur, anhelat
> Mens imbuta malis, mens semper docta nocere,
> Plus animum solito curis mordacibus angit
> Acrius insanit multo sitis ebria damno,
> Exemplo hydropis, quae plus perfusa liquore
> Plus eget, et dives plus undam potus egenat.
> Ergo nocere novus ad damna futura novatur
> Pullulat incipiens.

In the printed edition, the editor (102, n. 66) changes the reading *novus* to *volens* because, as he says, "mi offende." Specifically, he has no classical example of the usage, and he finds his reading makes better sense. The manuscript's *nocere novus*, however, seems clearly to balance *docta nocere*. Urso would have been attracted to the alliterative *nocere novus ... novatur*. I would translate *mens ... docta nocere* as "a mind skilled in ways of doing injury." The phrase *nocere novus ad damna futura novatur* I translate as: "Refreshed, he renews his effort to inflict new injuries." For the same reason, Urso has made a verb from *egenus* to accord with *eget*.

[103] Vittorio Cian, "Un epincio genovese del Dugento," in *Scritti minori*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1936), 2:79, renders a harsher judgment on Urso's work: "Ma il classicismo in questo poemetto è qualche cosa di esteriore e quasi di meccanico, in buona parte; e poco più e poco meglio d'una vernice ancora disuguale. L'autore, si capisce, ha fatto l'orecchio all'esametro virgiliano e forse più ancora a quello di Lucano, riuscendo talvolta ad accostarsigli nella sonorità, uniforme e monotone, del verso, non

Belonging to the generation after Urso, Stefanardo da Vimercate (d. 1297) differed from the other contemporary Latin poets whom I have mentioned in that he was a cleric. The son of a prominent Milanese family, he became a Dominican friar at an early age. While an exceptionally good grammarian, he spent at least the last decade of his life as a professor of theology in the Dominican *studio* of Milan. In addition to his poetic works, he is credited with a number of philosophical and theological prose treatises, whose language is medieval in character but minimally marked by technical scholastic jargon.[104]

His first surviving poem, *De controversia hominis et fortunae*, dealt with the relationship between human will, fortune, and Divine Providence in human affairs. The theme had personal significance for Stefanardo: he was seeking to understand the meaning behind the death of two brothers in prison, the judicial murder of his father, and the confiscation of the family's property by the victorious enemy faction

---

privo di zeppe, dovuto alla tirannia delle quantità, e non privo d'irregolarità metriche."

Although some of the array of references to ancient Latin authors made by the Genoese encyclopedist Giovanni Balbi in his *Catholicon*, published in 1286, may be derivative, my sense is that many were taken directly from the sources themselves. The work of Urso and Balbi suggests that, at least in their generations, Genoa was a center of renewed interest in ancient literature. On Balbi, see A. Pratesi, "Balbi, Giovanni (Iohannes Balbus, de Balbis, de Ianua)," *DBI* 5 (Rome, 1963), 369–70.

A comparision of the quantity of references to ancient authors in Balbi with the small number found in Uguccione da Pisa's *Magnae derivationes*, finished in 1192, provides an insight into the advances made in the study of these authors in a ninety-year period. For the biography of Uguccione, see Gaetano Catalano, "Contributo alla biografia di Uguccio da Pisa," *Diritto ecclesiastico* 65 (1954): 33–67. Claus Riessner, *Die Magnae Derivationes des Uguccione da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie* (Rome, 1965), 21–37, has studied Uguccione's sources and concludes (37): "Gut die Hälfte der *Derivationes* stammt aus den beiden Hauptquellen *Osbern* und *Isidor*. Für noch ein Viertel des Werks können wir mit ziemlicher Sicherheit die Herkunft bestimmen, wobei in erster Linie *Priscian* mit grammatikalischen Kommentaren, *Papias*, *Petrus Helie*, *Remigius*, *Servius* und *Glossensammlungen* zu nennen sind. Alles übrige (etwa 20 %) berüht z.T. auf Quellen, die noch genauer erforscht werden müssen." My sense is that Uguccione's use of the work of two mid-twelfth-century northern scholars, Peter Helias and Osbern of Canterbury, on whose *Panormia* he relied extensively, marks the Bolognese canon lawyer, who became bishop of Ferrara in 1190, as an early witness to the effect of transalpine influences. Riessner, *Die Magnae Derivationes*, 6–7, argues convincingly that, after having been largely written in Bologna, the work was completed at Ferrara in 1192.

[104] Cremaschi, *Stefanardo da Vimercate*, 1–12, provides a biography and description of his works.

in the Milanese civil war between 1256 and 1266. Stefanardo must surely have read Henry of Settimello's *Elegia*, because his own *De controversia* was similarly concerned with fortune and was structured like the *Elegia* as a debate. But whereas the *Elegia*'s final resolution to the conflict between fortune and human will lay in a garden-variety Stoicism, the *De controversia* offered a theologically informed discussion of the problem within a Christian context.[105] Like Henry of Settimello, Stefanardo drew his main stylistic inspiration from the elaborate French philosophical poems of the twelfth century, but Stefanardo's implementation was more theological and philosophically sophisticated. The French showed him the way to articulate a philosophical–theological conception in poetry, where pagan Latin poetry offered no model. But whereas Henry became a follower of the dominant French mannerist school, whose style was sanctioned by the *artes poetrie*, Stefanardo identified more with classicizing poets like Hildebert and Walter.[106] Stefanardo realized that he had made a choice of alliances. As he wrote in the prose preface to the *De controversia*:

> Because the material, inappropriate and difficult for another rule of metric, requires it, let not the frequent ecthlipsis here and there, against the custom of the moderns, and the often repeated synaloepha prove annoying to anyone.[107]

Whether or not his explanation was credible – it is difficult to see one style as intrinsically better-suited to his subject matter than another – the statement together with the poem showed him consciously choosing ancient metric over modern prosody.

Stefanardo's later, more classicizing *Liber de gestis* was rooted in the ancient Roman epic tradition. The opening lines of the work announce the passage from elegiac to epic verse:

---

[105] Ibid., 40 and 57–60.

[106] Ibid., 39–48.

[107] Ibid., 107: "Elipsim autem frequentatam alicubi contra modernorum morem aut sinalimpham sepius repetitam non fastidiat quia materia alteri legi metrice incompetens ac difficilis hoc requirit." "Ecthlipsis" and "synaloepha" are distinct types of elision. In ecthlipsis an *m* with a preceding vowel is suppressed when the next word begins with a vowel or *h*. In synaloepha a vowel or diphthong at the end of a word – if not an interjection – is partially suppressed when the next word begins with a vowel or *h*. See above, n. 82.

> Heroyicis cedant elegi, quia fata relinquo
> In patrios bacata lares; nunc gesta supersunt
> Meonio pangenda metro (bk. I, lines 5–7).[108]

The poem in two books encompassed the bloody factional struggle that divided Milan between 1259 and 1277. The first book dealt with the outbreak of violence between the nobles and the people occasioned in 1266 by the appointment of Ottone Visconti, the nobles' candidate, as archbishop. The second recounted the four years from the renewal of civil conflict in 1273 to the ultimate victory of the archbishop in 1277.

Although his range of knowledge of ancient Latin authors did not surpass that of Urso, Stefanardo's epic marked an advance from the standpoint of classical prosody and vocabulary. As it had for Italian epic writers before Urso, Stefanardo's decision to narrate events sequentially and (as he saw them) accurately intruded upon his poetic enterprise, but his poetic gifts remain unmistakable.[109] His grief, which vibrated through the lines describing his father's exile and unjust death, found consolation in the thought of his father's afterlife:

> Spiritus ethereas cuius subvectus in auras,
> Luciferas, prestante Deo, conscendat in edes (I, 141–42).[110]

He captured the emotion of patriotism in describing the exiled Visconti archbishop's desire to return:

> ad natale solum cuius dulcedinis unquam
> immemor esse nequit (II, 466–67).[111]

He borrowed gracefully from classical poets, for example, when he wrote of an ancient, now almost ruined city:

> antiqua fuit, antiqua diruta bellis (II, 37),[112]

---

[108] "Let elegies cede to heroic verse, because I leave the deaths that I have celebrated to my household gods. Now deeds remain to be beaten out in Homeric meter."

[109] "Aliqua etiam, tam poetice tam rethorice artis morem sequendo, addita sunt alicubi ornatus causa, non tamen veritati derogantia gestorum": *Liber de gestis*, 3.

[110] "Whose spirit borne in the heavenly air/ With God's aid, will ascend to the halls of light." Perhaps "ethereas auras" is Virgilian: *Aeneid* IV.445–6 or *Geor.* II.291.

[111] "To his native soil whose sweetness he can never forget." This passage echoes Ovid, *Ex ponto*, I.4.35–36: "Nescioqua natale solum dulcedine cunctos/ Ducit et immemores non sinit esse sui."

[112] "There was an ancient city, destroyed by ancient wars." This passage echoes *Aen.* I.12: "Urbs antiqua fuit, Tyrii tenuere coloni."

or again when he personified rumor:

> Fama leves tendens alas se tollit in auras (II, 61).[113]

Such fragments of verses exude a refinement of sensibility and suggestiveness of mood foreign to twelfth-century Italian epic poets and beyond Urso's capacity.

The sixth and final poet of the group, Lovato dei Lovati, was far superior to either Urso or Stefanardo in both talent and learning. The first to capture with consistency the flavor of the classical authors and to state explicitly that imitation of the ancients was his goal, Lovato may rightfully be considered the founder of Italian humanism. The work of Urso and Stefanardo shows, however, that Lovato was not a completely isolated figure. He was only the most successful among a small group of poets, inspired by the development of grammatical studies in Italy, who strove to make ancient poetic style their own.

Neither Urso nor Stefanardo, though, can be identified with the early phases of a humanist movement, whereas Lovato was the key figure in the movement's beginnings. Beyond his poetic and philological achievements, he institutionalized his stylistic goal by creating around him a circle of scholar–poets in Padua and nearby cities. Over the next century, responding in their own way (as did the vulgarizers of Latin literature in theirs) to the profoundly felt need of dominant elements in Italian society to ground their identity in the ancient past and draw inspiration from it, Lovato's successors pushed on with the classicizing enterprise, moving out from poetry to history, to the private epistle, and finally, by 1400, to the oration, which immensely expanded humanism's influence and import.

5

The literary activity of France and of northern and central Italy underwent a striking reversal in the course of the thirteenth century. In France, the dazzling possibilities created for young intellectuals by the recovery of the surviving Aristotelian corpus drew off most of the best intellects to the study of philosophy and theology. At the same

[113] "Rumor, extending her light wings, flew into the sky." The line is perhaps based on Vergil, *Aeneid* XI.455: "Clamor magnus se tollit ad auras."

time, within the discipline of grammar proper, the predominance of literature was challenged by two tendencies. One was practical. Aimed at organizing knowledge with greater efficiency and institutionalizing pedagogy, by 1200 it had inspired an enormous production of encyclopedias and course manuals, particularly textbooks of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, which fragmented the ancient literary heritage into *exempla* and precepts. The second tendency, called speculative grammar, was not concerned with literary texts but sought to establish a universal grammar underlying all languages.[114]

Neither tendency was in principle incompatible with producing literature, but in the event, French production of Latin poetry declined while manual-writing and speculative grammar burgeoned. Perhaps for independent reasons, the rich production of vernacular poetry also declined, first in *oc* and then in *oïl*. The combined result was that France lost its literary hegemony in western Europe.

Italian receptivity to French intellectual traditions began in the 1180s, just as the balance in France between proponents of the *auctores* (ancient literary writings) and their rivals, those who favored the *artes* (textbooks) and speculative grammar, was shifting. Because Italians had little background in ancient literature, it is not surprising that with the exception of Henry of Settimello's *Elegia*, the early witnesses to a revived Italian interest in pagan literary texts came from manuals, sources that did not necessarily reflect firsthand knowledge of the texts themselves. As for the theoretical alternative, lacking as they did any kind of philosophical tradition, Italians were slow to try their hand at establishing universal rules of language.[115]

---

[114] For bibliography on the conflict between the *auctores* and the *artes*, see Helene Wieruszowski, "Rhetoric and the Classics," 589–592. The history of the conflict between the *auctores* and the speculative grammarians remains to be written.

[115] Although late-twelfth- and early-thirteenth-century Italian grammars reflected French influence, Matteo of Bologna, who appears to belong to the second half of the thirteenth century, was the first Italian representative of the tradition of speculative grammar I can identify. The best discussion of his work is by Irène Rosier, "Mathieu de Bologne et les divers aspects du pré-modisme," in *Insegnamento della logica a Bologna nel XIV secolo*, ed. D. Buzzetti, M. Ferriani, and A. Tabarroni (Bologna, 1992), 73–108. The article is followed by Rosier's edition of Matteo's *Quaestiones super modos significandi et super grammaticam*, (Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Astr. 1, fols. 94–101). Gian C. Alessio, "I trattati di Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 24 (1981): 168, refers to a eulogy of philosophy in which the link between grammar and philosophy is identified by Matteo da Gubbio, a fourteenth-century professor in philosophy, logic, and physics at Bologna.

After 1250, however, in at least a few cities of northern Italy, the wealth of Latin poetic compositions redolent with classical allusions suggests that formal training in ancient Latin literature had become available. Lovato, the leading northern Italian poet of the second half of the century, could not have written his poetry without studying a wide range of ancient poets intensively. While humanists never dispensed with the use of the *artes* in the form of manuals – indeed, they authored many of their own – , they concentrated on close reading of ancient texts.

The Italian humanists' ultimate vindication of the *auctores* against the *artes* was not a victory over medievalism *per se* but rather over one medieval approach to ancient literature in defense of another. Their successful championing of the *auctores*, moreover, represented only one phase – albeit a long-enduring one – in a recurrent struggle within the western grammatical tradition among the conflicting claims of the study of literature, of theory, and of practical composition, a struggle well-known to our own age.

CHAPTER THREE

PADUA AND THE ORIGINS OF HUMANISM

The practice in contemporary scholarship of considering Petrarch the first humanist has resulted in a foreshortened view of Italian Renaissance humanism and a misinterpretation of his actual role in its development. Setting Petrarch's Christianized version of humanism and his syncretic stylistic theory at the origins of the movement has distorted our perspective of its evolution between the generations of Mussato and Bruni. Petrarch was the first to formulate a program and a goal for humanists, but he was preceded by two generations of scholars and literary men with interests in and attitudes toward the ancients much like his own. Petrarch joined a scholarly and literary movement that was already more than seventy years old, and his own contributions built on an inheritance. In some respects, Petrarch and the generation following him represented a hiatus between Bruni and Poggio on the one hand and the early humanists on the other. Among Petrarch's predecessors, Lovato dei Lovati stands out as the progenitor of the movement, which began not in Florence but in Padua.

1

In a succinct section of his classic monograph, *Padua in the Age of Dante*, John K. Hyde draws a sharp contrast between the political and social life of Padua and that of Florence around 1300. About a quarter the size of Florence, Padua drew its income principally from the exploitation of its contado.[1] Whereas for the Florentine upper class of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, commerce and industry were respectable ways of earning money, for the Paduan upper class trade was considered not quite respectable, and merchants tended to be regarded as probable usurers. Because mercantile and industrial interests were relatively weak, political power in

[1] John K. Hyde, *Padua in the Age of Dante* (London, 1966), 193–94.

the Paduan commune fell primarily to landholding magnates and a large and powerful administrative class composed of notaries and judges.

As Hyde points out, the character of Paduan society and culture must be understood in the wider context of the Veneto mainland, the region including Padua and its three neighboring cities, Verona, Vicenza, and Treviso.[2] The economy of all four was based on agriculture. Intense commercial and diplomatic relations among the cities were reinforced by a variety of social and political ties. The dynamics of political life depended on the interaction of three great families, the Estensi, the da Camino, and the Camposanpiero.[3] Within each of the four cities, politics were driven by interurban factions faithful to one or another of the great houses, and citizens' loyalty to their commune often took second place. The destruction of the da Romano tyrants by 1260 resuscitated the communal organization in each city, but after decades of crises, each in turn fell under signorial rule. Padua was the last to submit, in 1328.

Venice, the great commercial emporium only twelve miles away from Padua across the lagoons, was an important secondary tributary to Paduan culture. Venice served as a conduit to the region for the literature of the *langue d'oil* and eagerly exchanged its own literary creations in various vernaculars with those from the mainland. Although the commercial orientation of the city favored a flexible social structure – in contrast with the towns of the mainland whose wealth stemmed primarily from agriculture – at least by the end of the thirteenth century, Venice was beginning to apply definitions of social and political status that would drastically circumscribe social mobility and somewhat reduce economic mobility. The line between

[2] Ibid., 194–95. Taken together, the four Veneto cities would have been about the size of Florence at the time. David Herlihy and Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Les Toscans et leurs familles: Une étude du Catasto florentin de 1427* (Paris, 1978), 68–69, estimate the population of Florence before the plague at about 120,000. Herlihy and Klapisch-Zuber (212) give the size of Verona in 1425 as 14,225 and of Florence in 1427 as 38,000. If the same ratio prevailed in the early fourteenth century, Verona would have had a population of about 45,000. Benjamin Kohl, *Padua under the Carrara, 1318–1405* (Baltimore and London, 1998), 8, counts a population of 30,000 for Padua in 1320. Given that Treviso and Vicenza were both smaller than Padua or Verona, the combined population of the four cities would probably have been only slightly larger than that of Florence.

[3] A fourth powerful house, the da Romano, the family of Ezzelino, had been exterminated in 1259/60.

noble and commoner became more difficult to cross, and within the body of the commoners, a special professional class known as *cittadini* took shape. From the *cittadini* came the doctors and lay notaries. Thriving economically like Florence, but primarily as a commercial power, Venice in 1300 nevertheless resembled the other cities of the Veneto in its restrictive social tendencies.

Common to the whole Veneto region was a multilingual literary production. As I suggested in the first chapter, such linguistic complexity made an essential contribution to the art of classicizing, because it accustomed writers to seek literary expression in foreign languages. Writers sharpened their sensitivity to syntactical forms peculiar to literary composition in other languages and trained themselves to assume temporarily the thought patterns of those languages. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that classicizing began in the Veneto.

The diversity of languages extended beyond Provençal, the language of lyric in the Veneto, and French (Franco-Venetian), the language of major poetic narrative. The BAV, *Barb. lat.* 3953, which contains a collection of writings put together by Niccolò de' Rossi of Treviso sometime between 1325 and 1335, illustrates the complex linguistic milieu of the area. Besides poetry in Tuscan and local vernaculars influenced by it, the collection includes a Latin history of the Trojan War; a Latin letter from Pseudo-Dionysius to Alexander; a letter in Franco-Venetian from Isolde to Tristan; a canzone in Provençal; and a Trevisan canzone, *Auliver*, written in a mixture of Trevisan dialect, Provençal, and Franco-Venetian. Except for the Tuscan poems and those based on Tuscan models, the collection accurately reflects the complicated linguistic milieu of the Veneto three-quarters of a century earlier.[4]

Just as Provençal and French were tied to specific literary genres, so there was a tendency for the local vernaculars to be used in the region's didactic and popular minstrel poetry, both of which were heavily dependent on Provençal and northern French antecedents in form and content. Usually written in a variant of northern Italian

[4] Furio Brugnolo, "I Toscani nel Veneto e le cerchie toscaneggianti," *SCV* 2:375–77. The history of the manuscript tradition is given by Corrado Bologna, "Tradizione testuale e fortuna dei classici italiani," *LI* 7.1:528–32. See F. Brugnolo, *Il canzoniere di Nicolò de' Rossi*, 2 vols. (Padua, 1974). Brugnolo's edited version of the text appears in vol. 1, *Introduzione, testo e glossario* (Padua, 1974). Brugnolo discusses the work in vol. 2, *Lingua, tecnica, cultura poetica* (Padua, 1977).

koine bearing marks of local speech, the surviving series of didactic works begins with the *Proverbia quae dicuntur super natura feminarum*, inspired by the twelfth-century French poem *Chastiemusart*. Originally written either in Venice or the area north of the city, the poem refers to events occurring between 1152 and 1160.[5] One of the earliest dated minstrel poems in the Veneto, the short *Lamenta della buona sposa padovanna*, also known as *Frammento papafava*, is probably part of a longer piece. Composed in the region of Padua probably before 1277, the *Lamenta* combines erotic and courtly elements with moral didactics.[6]

A number of thirteenth-century poems in both genres survive that are written in the koine of the Veneto, but we cannot date them with certainty. In Lovato's generation, the only identifiable Italian vernacular poet was the Minorite Giacomino da Verona (fl. 1230–63), author of a number of passionately religious poems.[7] With Mussato's generation, probably under Tuscan influence, numerous lyric poems appeared in Italian vernacular. Among the array of local Italian vernacular poets was Aldobrandino dei Mezzabati, whose Tuscanizing poetry Dante mentioned among the northern contributions to the genre.[8]

Literary prose works in local vernacular were mostly translations or adaptations of Latin writings. Mid-thirteenth-century Venetian translations exist for Latin works like Cato's *Disticha* and the popular twelfth-century *Pamphilus*, composed in northern France.[9] The Vene-

[5] The work is published by G. Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 2 vols. (Verona, 1960), 1:523–55. Contini maintains that the work was produced in the area around Venice (521–22), but reviewing Contini's book, Maria Corti, *Lettere italiane* 13 (1961): 511, argues for Treviso. For discussion and bibliography, see Corrado Bologna, "La letteratura dell'Italia settentrionale nel Duecento," *LI* 1:142–44.

[6] The poem is published by Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 1:806–09. See also Contini's bibliographical note, 2:852. The nature of the work has been variously interpreted: Anna Lomazzi, "Primi monumenti del volgare," *SCV* 1:622–23; and Corrado Bologna, "La letteratura," 156–57.

[7] E.I. May, *The De Jerusalem celesti and the De Babylonia civitate infernali of Giacomino da Verona* (London, 1930), 29, dates the *De Jerusalem* ca. 1230 and the *De Babylonia* at least twenty years later, with possible additions made after 1263. Contini publishes both poems in his *Poeti del Duecento*, 1:627–52. For bibliography, see ibid., 2:842–43.

[8] Corrado Bologna, "Tradizione testuale," 525–26.

[9] On these translations, see Lomazzi, "Primi monumenti," 629–32. The *Disticha* is edited by A. Tobler, *Die altvenezianische Übersetzung der Sprüche des Dionysios Cato*, Abhandlungen der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (Berlin, 1883), 1–83. The critical edition of the translation of *Pamphilus* is by Hermann Haller, *Il Panfilo veneziano* (Florence, 1982). See the review article by Paolo

to area – probably Venice – also produced a translation of the *Imago mundi* by the twelfth-century French scholar, Honorius of Autun.[10] Finally, local translations of minor, mostly anonymous Latin writings, such as bestiaries and collections of moral examples, circulated in the region.[11] Residents of the area preferred copying French prose works, such as *Li fait des Romains* and Benedict de Sainte Maure's *Roman de Troie*, from French manuscripts rather than translating them.[12] There is no evidence of translations of any of the great literary or historical works of Latin antiquity.

The classicizing activity of the first generation of humanists in the Veneto began in this environment of rich and varied literary production in the vernaculars. The new interest was largely confined to the Veneto mainland. While Venice as well had a share in vernacular literary production, cultural and intellectual differences militated against the city's participation in classicizing. The merchant patriciate's focus on trade discouraged scholarly literary movements. Although Venetians looked back to Byzantine antecedents as well as Roman ones, they lacked the linguistic knowledge to exploit their Greek-speaking heritage, while at the same time they lacked the legal culture that might have spurred interest in the Roman one. Venetian law was a potpourri of ad hoc local legislation, largely the contingent result of negotiation between interested parties. Venetian jurists supposed that the city's laws had originally been drawn from Greek sources, which implied a connection through Byzantium with universal principles shared by Roman law. In practice, too, statutes were often glossed by references to Roman law. Nevertheless, the Venetians largely lacked the rhetorical–legal culture of the mainland,

---

Trovato in *Medioevo romanzo* 10 (1985): 137–45. Linguistically, the two texts could have their origin on the Veneto mainland rather than in Venice (Lomazzi, "Primi monumenti," 631–32).

[10] On the *Imago*, see Bodo Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," in *Die italienische Literatur im Zeitalter Dantes und am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Renaissance*, ed. August Buck, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1987), 2:340.

[11] C. Segre and M. Marti, *La prosa del Duecento* (Milan, 1959), 298–99, discuss the Tuscan and Venetian traditions of the *Il libro della natura degli animali*. In Segre's opinion, the Venetian is the earliest. *Il libro dei sette savi*, containing moral lessons, had both a Tuscan and Venetian tradition. The Venetian tradition, based on a Latin text, can only be dated from the fourteenth century (Segre and Marti, *La prosa del Duecento*, 312).

[12] Lorenzo Renzi, "Il francese come lingua letteraria e il franco-lombardo. L'epica carolingia nel Veneto," *SCV* 1:577.

which encouraged receptivity to ancient Roman literature and history.

The weakness of the rhetorical–legal culture affected the status of the Venetian notariate. The major carriers of humanist learning from the beginning, the lay notaries, had never been as numerous nor as collectively powerful in Venice as on the mainland. Venice's notariate, in which lay and clerical notaries intermingled in Byzantine fashion, even lacked an official organization.[13] In the next century, Venetian notaries would be primarily responsible for whatever humanist enterprise did appear in the city, but even then, not much Latin scholarship or literary composition would be produced.

Venice might seem to have been an ideal port of entry for Greek influence, just as it was for French, but that was not the case. No evidence exists to show that the mainland renewal of study and imitation of ancient Latin texts in the thirteenth century was connected with the contemporary revival in Byzantium of interest in ancient Greek texts.[14] In 1253/63, Ventura da Foro di Longulo of Bergamo exhibited some knowledge of Greek in discussing a passage in Persius.[15] The eminent bilingual Greek scholar, Maximus Planudes, was in Venice in 1296, and a contemporary Greek manuscript of books one to sixty-nine of Plutarch's *Moralia*, annotated and corrected by the master, belonged to Pace of Ferrara, a professor of logic and grammar, in the early decades of the fourteenth century.[16] Pace gave no indication of having read the work, however, nor did anyone in the literary circles of the four mainland cities seem to know Greek. Only the eminent Paduan natural philosopher Pietro d'Abano, who taught medicine and philosophy at Padua between 1306 and 1315, gained mastery of the language, and he had doubtless learned it

[13] G. Cracco, "Relinquere laicis que laicorum sunt: Un intervento di Eugenio IV contro i preti-notai di Venezia," Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e della Stato veneziano 3 (1961): 179–89.

[14] M. Gigante, "La cultura latina a Bisanzio nel sec. XIII," *La parola del passato* 17 (1962): 32–51.

[15] Pietro A. Uccelli, "Un foglio di Persio con commento dal XIII secolo," *Archivio storico italiano*, 3rd ser. 22 (1875): 146. Uccelli publishes (138–56) a folio from the commentary now lost. For other bibliography, see G. Cremaschi, "Un codice e un commentatore bergamasco di Persio del secolo XIII (A.D. 1253)," *Bergamum* 40 (1946): 21–29; and Dorothy Robathan and F.E. Cranz, "Persius," in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, F.E. Cranz, vol. 3 (Washington, 1976), 243–44.

[16] Philip A. Stadter, "Planudes, Plutarch and Pace of Ferrara," *IMU* 16 (1973): 137–44 and 152–62.

during a sojourn in Constantinople.[17] Although d'Abano and the humanists were acquainted, they had different interests in the texts.

That none of Lovato dei Lovati's friends and fellow scholars were Venetian provides further evidence that the Venetians lacked interest in the new studies. Lovato's writings indicate that the men he associated with were either from the mainland Veneto or other parts of northern Italy. Similarly, in the next generation, the pitiful poetry of the Venetian chancellor, Tanto dei Tanti, attests to the impoverished state of scholarly work in Venice.

2

Petrarch, who rarely mentioned a medieval or contemporary writer, spoke with praise of Lovato dei Lovati in his earliest surviving prose treatise, *Rerum memorandarum libri*, in 1344:

> Lovato of Padua would in recent times easily have been the prince of all the poets whom our age or that of our fathers knew, if he had not, in embracing the studies of the civil law, mixed the Twelve Tables with the nine Muses and turned his attention from heavenly concerns to the noise of the courtroom.[18]

Nonetheless, Petrarch observed, his "reputation [as a poet] was well-known in that time not only in Padua but throughout all Italy."[18bis] Petrarch made the remarks casually as a preface to a humorous incident in the life of the judge–poet in a section of the *Rerum memorandarum* devoted to examples of humor. There is no information about Lovato's education. Padua's *studio*, the commune's university, which flourished in the 1220s, did not survive the advent of Ezzelino in 1237, and only after his death on October 7, 1259, did the commune undertake to re-establish it. Persecuted by Ezzelino, the Do-

[17] On d'Abano, see Stadter, "Planudes," 156–57, as well as Franco Alessio, "Filosofia e scienza: Pietro da Abano," *SCV* 2:171–206, with rich bibliography. Alessio offers an explanation for Mussato's use of Greek in his *De lite* (ibid., 156).

[18] *Rerum memorandarum libri*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich, Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca, no. 14 (Florence, 1943), 84: "Lovatus patavinus fuit nuper poetarum omnium quos nostra vel patrum nostrorum vidit etas facillime princeps, nisi iuris civilis studium amplexus et novem Musis duodecim tabulas immiscuisset et animum ab eliconiis curis ad forensem strepitum deflexisset."

[18bis] More specifically, Petrarch appears to be reporting the view of Lovato's Paduan contemporaries: he (the judge who did not know that he was speaking to Lovato) "ab astantibus didicit Lovatum esse, cuius ea tempestate non Padua tantum celebris, sed per tota Italiam fama erat" (ibid.).

minicans of St. Augustine and the Franciscans of St. Maria Mater Domini persevered through these years, and they may have offered some form of secondary education. Perhaps former grammar professors of the defunct *studio* remained in Padua, offering lessons privately.

In any case, within a month of Ezzelino's death, Rolandino of Padua (d. 1276) was referred to in a document as *magister Rolandinus paduanus professor gramatice facultatis*, that is, as a professor of grammar in the communal *studio*. The first list of professors in the college of liberal studies in the *studio* appeared only in 1262, when their names are listed as attending a public reading of Rolandino's *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie trivixane*.[19] Even though the first concern of the commune was to train civil lawyers, the list of three professors of natural science, one of logic, and six of grammar and rhetoric indicates that the commune also generously supported liberal studies.

We know more of Rolandino than of the other five grammarians teaching with him.[20] In addition to teaching grammar and rhetoric in Padua's *studio*, he served intermittently as a notarial official in the communal government and on occasion wrote documents for private parties.[21] A student of Boncompagno at Bologna, he was skilled in *ars dictaminis* and, as his *Cronica* shows, knew some of the pagan authors.[22] By the 1220s, even before going to Bologna, a Paduan student like

[19] On the refounding of the *studio* in 1261, see Girolamo Arnaldi, "Il primo secolo dello studio di Padova," *SCV* 2:14–15. The discovery of a document of 1259 by Carlo Polizzi, "Rolandinus Paduanus professor gramatice facultatis," *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 17 (1984): 231–32, suggests that at least by November 1259, the *studio* was functioning in some way. See also Paolo Marangon, "Scuole e Università a Padova dall 1221–1256: Nuovi documenti," in his *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare: Gli studi nell'Università e nei conventi di Padova nei secoli XIII e XIV*, ed. T. Pesenti (Trieste, 1997), 47–54. At the conclusion of his *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie Trivixane*, ed. A. Bonardi, *RIS*, new ser., 8.1 (Città di Castello, 1905–08), 173–74, Rolandino provides the list of professors. While no professors of medicine are given as present at the reading, medicine and liberal studies probably were already combined in the same faculty: Nancy Siraisi, *Arts and Sciences at Padua: The Studium of Padua before 1350* (Toronto, 1973), 22–23.

[20] See notes to *Cronica*, 173. Two of the professors, Montenaro and Morando, authored goliardic poems (Hyde, *Padua in the Age of Dante*, 294). To Hyde's note, I would add F. Novati, *Carmina medii aevi* (Turin, 1883), 57–58 and 69–70, which contains Morando's poem.

[21] Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," *SCV* 2:19–20, believes Rolandino was the son of Jacopino di Baialardo, a Paduan notary. But see Paolo Marangon, "La *Quadriga* e i *Proverbi* di maestro Arsegino," in his *Ad Cognitionem Scientiae Festinare*, 16–17.

[22] His history makes references to Sallust, Ovid, Lucan, Horace, and Virgil.

Rolandino might already have been aware of the changes taking place in *ars dictaminis* locally.[23] Arsegino, a Paduan rhetorician who had also studied at Bologna but several decades before Rolandino and was closer to the first years of the "French invasion" of the Bolognese *studio*, had already incorporated references to pagan authors in his didactic treatises by the 1220s.[24]

Currently we have no way of knowing when the enthusiasm for ancient literature resulted in formal teaching of the ancient writers either at the university or grammar-school level. The intensification of grammatical studies, as I have suggested, did not necessarily mean that the ancient literary and historical texts were themselves studied. Similarly, in writing their manuals, *dictatores* such as Boncompagno and Arsegino may have drawn directly on the texts rather than borrowing them from earlier manuals, but that would not entail that they also formally taught the ancient material. As teachers of *dictamen*, they almost certainly did not, with the exception of the Ciceronian manuals *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium*.

Still, it seems likely that by the middle decades of the thirteenth century, university courses in ancient literature were being offered at both Padua and Bologna, and perhaps also at Arezzo. The sophistication of Italian grammarians by this time is apparent in Ventura da Foro di Longulo's commentary on Persius.[25] Ventura's grammatical and lexical notes, which filled the spaces between the lines of Persius's text and spilled over into the spaces between the columns, were complemented by frequent historical and philological notes in the page margins. Ventura's comments caught the spirit of the satire,

---

[23] Marangon, "La *Quadriga*," 33, convincingly argues that Arsegino was a student at Bologna before 1211. Arsegino's manual of *dictamen*, *Quadriga*, was of the new variety initiated by Boncompagno in the 1190s, in which frequent references were made to ancient literature. The dominant model of *artes dictaminis* in the twelfth century was Adalbertus of Samaria's *Praecepta dictaminum*, ed. F.J. Schmale, *MGH*, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, no. 3 (Weimar, 1961), where, aside from a few generic references to Cicero, citations of ancient authors are minimal. For Arsegino's classical references, see Marangon, "La *Quadriga*," 24, and text of *Quadriga*, 41–46.

[24] Boncompagno is the best witness to the passionate interest in grammatical studies in Bologna around 1190, sparked by French influence: see my "Boncompagno and the Defense of Rhetoric," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986): 1–26. See more generally my "Medieval Italian Culture and the Origins of Humanism as a Stylistic Ideal," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. A. Rabil, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1988), 3:44–51.

[25] For the text, see above, 86, n. 15. My characterization of the text is taken from Cremaschi, "Un codice," 23.

creating what Cremaschi calls "a dialogical form with a serious and ironic tone."[26] More important, Ventura envisaged the ancient work as part of a larger group of writings, and he offered interpretations of passages of Persius, a difficult author, that remain respectable by modern standards. The BAM, Q 75 sup., suggests, first, that a sophisticated grammatical culture was available closer to Padua by the second half of the century, and second, that reform of the grammar-school curriculum may already have been underway in the Veneto. An eleventh-century Italian manuscript containing the complete works of Horace, Q 75 sup. was probably in Treviso throughout the thirteenth century and belonged for a time to a teacher who used two of the final pages of the manuscript (fols. 123v and 125) to keep records of payments received from students.[27] His was probably not the hand, however, that made substantial corrections and comments on the first part of the second letter of the *Epistulae*, sometime in the middle of the century. The corrections suggest that the manuscript was collated with another of the same text. The corrected text, accompanied by comments attempting to clarify the meaning of the work, created a dialogue with the poet and directed the reader to specific passages. The text was probably used for teaching purposes by a master wishing to give his students the most accurate text of Horace that he could. The grammatical expertise and scholarly quality of BAV, *Vat. Lat.*, 3207, a collated text of Provençal poetry also produced in Treviso, testify to the high quality of philological activity in the Veneto in the second half of the thirteenth century.

Rolandino was not unusual among notaries in dividing his time between teaching and notarial practice. Whereas Rolandino had a relatively prestigious position, however, most others taught in humbler circumstances, like the Genoese *magister Bartolomeus notarius*, who probably taught school in his own house, with the help of young apprentice notaries.[28]

The role of notaries as professional teachers of rhetoric is well-known, but it has often been overlooked that in the thirteenth and

[26] Cremaschi, "Un codice," 23.

[27] Giuseppe Frasso, "Erudizione classica e letterature romanze in terra trevigiana: Orazio Ambrosiano Q 75 sup.," *IMU* 27 (1984): 30–32 and 36–38.

[28] Giovanni Petti Balbi, *Insegnamento nella Liguria medievale: Scuole, maestri, libri* (Genoa, 1979), 18. Portions of the document dated 1221, describing the arrangement between teacher and apprentice, are published by Giuseppe Manacorda, *Storia della scuola in Italia*, vol. 1 in 2 pts. (Milan and Palermo, 1913), 140–42.

fourteenth centuries they also taught grammar. The qualifications for being a notary differed widely from one area to another, but educational requirements were always lower than those demanded for being a lawyer, and the field was perennially overcrowded. The 1,171 notaries licensed to practice in Bologna between 1219 and 1240 and the more than 1,183 notaries writing documents in Pisa between 1270 and 1330 could not all have survived by alternating private notarial practice with communal employment.[29] Some notaries were able to maintain themselves by holding a succession of the short-term notarial offices characteristic of communal appointments, but for most only occasional work with the commune was available. Teaching grammar as well as rhetoric provided notaries with a third way of making a living, and they could always prepare documents for private individuals in their spare time. The notary–teacher was as common in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Veneto cities, like Padua, Treviso, Vicenza, and Verona, as he was in contemporary Florence or Genoa.[30]

In northern and central Italy, educated laymen, many of whom were notaries, provided scholarly services that in northern Europe were usually provided only by clerics. In the Veneto, elementary-level education was generally provided by the clergy at local parish churches. From the late twelfth century, however, an increasing de-

[29] On Bologna, see Roberto Ferrara, "'Licentia exercendi' ed esame di notariato," *Notariato medievale bolognese: Atti di un convegno (febbraio 1976)*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1977), 2:81. On Pisa, see Ottavio Banti, "Ricerche sul notariato a Pisa tra il secolo XIII a il secolo X1V: Note in margine al *Breve Collegii Notariorum* (1305)," *Bollettino storico pisano* 33 (1964): 181. The classical article on the role of the notary in Italian culture remains Francesco Novati's "Il notaio nella vita e nella letteratura italiana delle origini," *Freschi e mini del Dugento* (Milan, 1929), 241–64. Novati, however, does not deal with the important role of the notary in teaching grammar.

[30] Luciano Gargan, "Il preumanesimo a Vicenza, Treviso e Venezia," *SCV* 2:150, n. 58, for Vicenza, and 165, n. 150, for Treviso. In both cities, notaries in the fourteenth century constituted significant percentages of the grammar teachers. On notaries as teachers in other Italian cities, see Paul Gehl, *A Moral Art: Grammar, Society, and Culture in Trecento Florence* (Ithaca and London, 1993), 209–10 and 217; and Franco Cardini, "Alfabetismo e livelli di cultura nell'età comunale," *Alfabetismo e cultura scritta*, ed. A. Bartoli-Langelli and A. Petrucci, *Quaderni storici*, n.s., 38 (1978): 500–01. Notaries went back and forth between teaching and other employment. See the career of Pietro da Asolo: Luciano Gargan, "Giovanni Conversini e la cultura letteraria a Treviso nella seconda metà del Trecento," *IMU* 8 (1965): 100–01, n. 3. On Florence, see Witt, "What did Giovannino Read and Write? Literacy in Early Renaissance Florence," *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 6 (1995): 89–93.

mand for basic education, enormous by comparison with northern Europe, encouraged notaries and other laypeople, possibly including a few women, to share elementary teaching responsibilities with the clergy.[31] After 1200, teaching in the grammar schools seems to have become a male monopoly and increasingly the work of laymen. By the late thirteenth century, at least in large cities, grammar was largely taught by laymen, most of whom were notaries.

The notarial profession was linked with humanism, therefore, through the notary's role as a teacher of grammar. Modern scholars have spoken loosely of lawyers and notaries as constituting the backbone of the corps of humanists in the first two centuries of the movement's history. They have explained this phenomenon by alluding to the rhetorical character of legal work, the historical nature of the study of Roman and canon law, and the practical, secular focus of legal studies.[32] Drawing attention to the compatibility of legal studies and humanism is justified, but the nature of the connection between the legal profession and humanism has not been sufficiently explored.

The role of the lawyer in the humanist movement should not be exaggerated. Azzo and Accursius were among a small number of Roman lawyers going back to Placentinus who manifested some knowledge of the Roman literary heritage. For the lawyer, though, literary studies were usually an avocation. Lawyers earned too much from practicing litigation to waste their time on ordinary school teaching. When they did teach, they taught Roman law, which paid better than any other discipline in a *studio*.

Aside from Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Bruni, who never finished their degrees and never practiced law, the number of lawyers who contributed to the movement was very small – at least until the fifteenth century. In the fourteenth century, it would be difficult to name any besides Geri d'Arezzo and Lapo da Castiglionchio. Humanism, from Lovato's generation to the early fifteenth century, was an enterprise of notaries.

---

[31] See the example of Clementia teaching elementary school in Florence in the early years of the fourteenth century: S. Debenedetti, "Sui più antichi *doctores puerorum* a Firenze," *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 333.

[32] See, for example, Dennis Hay, *The Italian Renaissance in its Historical Background*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge and New York, 1962), 72–76; and Jerrold Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism: The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom (Petrarch to Valla)* (Princeton, 1968), 207–08.

To emphasize the relationship of rhetoric to law is to suppose that humanism was in its early stages a rhetorical movement, a supposition which overlooks its orientation toward poetry from the 1260s until late in the following century. Rhetoric remained largely unreformed during this period, and notaries, as teachers of rhetoric, taught traditional materials. Despite its eventual and gradual penetration of other literary genres, creative imitation occurred first in poetry. Oration and public letter writing, the genres most closely allied to rhetoric, were the last to be reformed.

The large role played by notaries in early humanism, therefore, stemmed from their work in the grammar schools. Rhetorical training did play a role in their endeavors. It helped them to impart a sense of the importance of audience and the perspectival nature of truth. It also encouraged mental flexibility. But until the late fourteenth century, the fruits of humanistic training contributed to reforms in areas of learning traditionally belonging to grammar.[33]

Already before the closing of the Paduan *studio* in 1237, Rolandino may have had a role in establishing formal training in the Latin classics, but this is conjecture. Whether or not Lovato managed in some way to study with Rolandino or any of the other five professors of grammar and rhetoric during his teens in the 1250s, while Padua's *studio* was officially closed, his philological interests were doubtless influenced by the Paduan cultural milieu, precociously enlivened by a new perception of the value of ancient literature and intellectually less tradition-bound than the milieu of Bologna, where advanced education in Italy had begun.[34] Lovato's innovation of using Carolingian script for notarial documents, by 1261 at the latest, is best attributed not to the influence of any teacher but rather to the fascination exerted by the Carolingian manuscripts that transmitted an-

[33] In speaking of notaries as grammarians or as rhetoricians, it is important to remember that the same notaries taught grammar and rhetoric. It is essential for an understanding of early humanism, however, to emphasize their teaching as grammarians.

[34] In my view, Bologna, the major university town of the peninsula, lagged behind Padua in introducing the ancient authors into its classrooms, at least at the grammar-school level. See below, 294. Nevertheless, an increasing demand for grammar training in Bologna in the course of the thirteenth century is suggested by the change in requirements for students wishing to become notaries. The communal statutes of Bologna in 1246 required two years of grammar training for the notariate, whereas in 1290–91, the statutes required five years: Ferrara, "*Licentia exercendi*," 2:110, n. 45. For those studying canon law early in the century, only three years of grammar were required. See above, 57, n. 61.

cient literature to him.[35]

Even if Lovato had had the eminent Rolandino as his private teacher during the period of Ezzelino da Romano's domination of the city, he probably would not have learned much from his master about composing poetry. Explaining why he did not compose his *Cronica* in verse, the prevailing convention for history writing in the second half of the thirteenth century (as we saw in the last chapter with Urso, Stefanardo, and Bonifazio), Rolandino wrote at the outset of his work:

> I also write in prose because I know that I am able to say what I shall say more fully in prose than in verse and since in this age prose *dictamen* is more intelligible to everyone than metric. But would that Virgil and Lucan were alive, since they would have the kind of material worthy of their exalted genius and I would properly be kept silent![36]

Rolandino's lack of poetic talent, rather than his concern for readers' understanding, better explains his use of prose. In fact, he conceded that epic poetry was the ideal medium. Had Virgil or Lucan lived in his time, he would not have written.[37]

Acknowledging the prevalence of historical narration in Padua, if perhaps only in oral form, Rolandino hoped that his Latin history would be as instructive as vernacular histories:[38]

---

[35] Carolingian script, the dominant bookhand of western Europe from the ninth to the eleventh century, served as the basis for humanist script after 1400. See Berthold Ullman's classic, *The Origins and Development of Humanist Script* (Rome, 1960). On Lovato's use of Carolingian script, see Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 28–32; and Giuseppe Billanovich, "Alle origini della scrittura umanistica: Padova 1261 e Firenze 1397," in *Miscellanea Augusto Campana*, ed. R. Avesani et al., 2 vols. (Padua, 1981), 1:125–40.

[36] *Cronica*, 7-8: "Scribo quoque prosayce hac de causa, quia scio, que dixero, posse dici a me per prosam plenius quam per versus, et cum sit his temporibus dictamen prosaicum intelligibilius quam metricum apud omnes. Sed utinam viveret Virgilius vel Lucanus, quoniam, imposito michi digne silencio, copiosam haberent materiam, qua suum possent altum ingenium exercere." It is important to note that the prose *dictamen* to which Rolandino refers is the contemporary *ars dictaminis*, not classical prose.

[37] We can assume that his master Boncompagno's prose history of the siege of Ancona in 1202, *Liber de obsidione Anconae*, gave him further justification for his own prose history. The most recent edition of Boncompagno's work is by G.C. Zimolo, *RIS*, new ser., 6.3 (Bologna, 1937), 3–50.

[38] Rolandino's assumption that vernacular histories were oral even for the literate suggests that *Li fait des Romains* and *Le roman de Troie* may not yet have been widely known. See another discussion of this passage in Girolamo Arnaldi and Lidia Cano, "I cronisti di Venezia e della Marca trevigiana dalle origini alla fine del secolo XIII," *SCV* 1:401–02.

> For perhaps what they find written in Latin of the injuries and trials of modern men will not be less useful or delightful to some, and chiefly to the educated, than what they hear (*audiunt*) about deeds of ancient nobles in the vernacular, which we commonly call the unrhymed [or rhymed?] romance language.[39]

3

Whoever his teacher was, the young Lovato profited in the 1250s and 1260s from the revival of formal study of the ancient texts in the *studio* of Padua. Lovato's father, ser Rolando di Lovato, a second-generation notary, seems to have intended his son for the same career, but he probably allowed him more training in grammar than required for the notariate and more than had been available in Padua earlier in the century. Nevertheless, the appearance of the son's signature as *Lovatus filius Rolandi notarii, regalis aule notarius* on a document written in Padua on July 22, 1257, when he was sixteen or seventeen, suggests that his days of formal schooling may have been over by then.[40] His admission on May 6, 1267, to Padua's College of Judges indicates that by that time he had completed at least six years of continuous legal study, the educational requirement for entrance into that body.[41]

The first two surviving examples of Lovato's poetry were composed within a year of his becoming a member of the College of

---

[39] *Cronica*, 8: "Nam forte non erit inutile vel delectabile minus aliquibus, et precipue literatis, id quod de modernorum iniuriis et laboribus scriptum per latinum invenient, quam quod de gestis nobilium antiquorum audiunt per vulgare, quod dirimatum vulgo dicimus et romanum." The word *dirimatum* could mean either rhymed or unrhymed. The word *romanum* (translated as "romance") probably means either Franco-Italian or *langue d'oïl*: G. Arnaldi, *Studi sui cronisti della Marca trevigiana nell'età di Ezzelino da Romano* (Rome, 1963), 144–46.

[40] On grounds of his signature as notary, I would assign 1240 or even 1239 as Lovato's date of birth, not 1241 as Sabbadini suggests: "Postille alle 'Epistole inedite di Lovato,'" *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 261. Eighteen and twenty were average ages for matriculating into local notarial guilds, but an exception could have been made for Lovato, the son of a notary: G. Arnaldi, "Scuole nella Marca trevigiana e a Venezia nel secolo XIII," *SCV* 1:364, n. 54. On Lovato's family background, see Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 23–28.

[41] The requirement of six years of legal education is found in a Paduan statute of 1265: Arnaldi, "Scuole nella Marca," 366, n. 67. Lovato never became a doctor of civil law, however: Weiss, "Lovato Lovati (1241–1309)," *Italian Studies* 6 (1951): 6. Cf. Paolo Marangon, "Università, giudici e notai a Padova nei primi anni del dominio ezzeliniano (1237–1241)," *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 12 (1979): 6.

Judges. The poems were written in the period when Conradin and Charles of Valois were struggling for possession of the Hohenstaufens' Italian inheritance. The first of the two poems was addressed to Lovato's friend Compagnino, a Paduan lawyer, who apparently was not living in Padua at the time.[42] Lovato had been ill, and he reported his illness to his friend in 227 lines of elegiac verse. The second poetic epistle, composed in dactylic hexameter, was probably sent days later. By this time, the poet felt good enough to think about marrying his fiancée.

From the outset of the first poem, the poet's voice resonates with echoes of antiquity:

> Accipe quam patria tibi mittit ab urbe salutem,
> Compagnine, tui cura secunda, Lupus.
> Scire voles, sic te socii iactura pericli
> Exagitat, quali est mea cumba lacu.

Here the *tui cura secunda, Lupus* draws either on Propertius, II.1, lines 25-26, or Statius, *Silvae*, IV.4, line 20; and *socii jactura ... / exagitat*

[42] On the identity of Compagnino, see Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 33. These two letters (numbered 4 and 5 by Cesare Foligno) along with two others of Lovato's (numbered 2 and 3) and one by Ugo Mezzabati (numbered 1) were originally published by Foligno, "Epistole inedite di Lovato de' Lovati e d'altri a lui," *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 47–58. Sabbadini, "Postille," 255–62, corrected the Foligno edition and made important comments on the texts. The four letters of Lovato (2–5 in the Foligno edition) have recently been re-edited: William P. Sisler, "An Edition and Translation of Lovato Lovati's *Metrical Epistles*," Ph.D. Diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1977. Guido Billanovich, "Lovato Lovati: L'epistola a Bellino: Gli echi di Catullo," *IMU* 32 (1989): 124–27, edits the letter addressed to Bellino Bissolo, as does Walter Ludwig, *Litterae neolatinae: Schriften zur neulateinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1989), 7–9. I shall paginate the letters according to the Sisler edition. Like Foligno, Sisler follows the order of the letters in the BL, *Add.* 19906, not the chronological order. Because he does not publish the letter of Mezzabati to Lovato, he numbers them 1–4. The letter of Lovato to Mezzabati (numbered 1 in Sisler), pp. 25–28, is usually dated ca. 1293 on the basis of Lovato's remark (line 25) that he was 52 (Sisler, "An Edition," 12). If, however, Lovato was born in 1240, instead of 1241 as Sisler believes, the poem was written in 1292. Because Guido Billanovich, "Lovato: L'epistola," 102, argues convincingly that the British Library manuscript was written around 1290, a date for letter 1 closer to 1290 would be more acceptable. The second letter, that addressed to Bellino from Treviso (Sisler, "An Edition," 38–43, was probably written in 1290, when Lovato was working there: Guido Billanovich, "Lovato: L'epistola," 104–05. The date 1267/68 is universally accepted for the writing of letters 3 and 4 (Sisler, "An Edition," 13–14). Letters 3 and 4 are found in Sisler, "An Edition," pp. 56–67 and 92–96. Billanovich, "Lovato: L'epistola," 101–10, maintains that the manuscript is an autograph, while Ludwig, *Litterae Neolatinae*, 30, questions the attribution of the handwriting to Lovato.

recalls either Propertius, III.7, lines 41-42, or Ovid, *Am.*, II.14, lines 31-32. Lovato may have been the first person to allude to Propertius or this particular work of Statius since ancient times. Almost immediately, lines follow that echo Tibullus, another poet exceedingly rare, if not totally unknown, to the Middle Ages. This is learned poetry, densely interspersed with ancient poetic fragments and mythological and biblical reminiscences. Too self-conscious and ponderous for the modern reader, the intensely referential verses of Lovato's poems must have delighted his audience, charmed by familiar literary associations set in a new context and intrigued about the origin of some of the expressions and imagery – in fact drawn from rare ancient texts – classical in character but unfamiliar.

Wasted by a fever lasting many days, despairing of help from his doctors, bedridden and desperate, Lovato described in the first poem how he finally resorted to magic. The scene may have been imagined or at least embellished. After describing the gyrations of the sorceress, a wrinkled old woman, who was about to administer a secret potion to him, Lovato elaborately described the contents of the magical mixture:[43]

> Postmodo secrete *Circaeas* aggerat *herbas*,
> *Quas* dederat *Pindos*, *Othrys*, *Olympus*, Athos,
> Quas Anthedonii gustarunt intima Glauci.
> *Nec* desunt monti *gramina lecta Rubro*
> Nec quae te refovent ictam serpente, Galanthi,
> Nec Florentini stamina fulva croci
> Additur his *myrrhae* facinus, gummique *Sabaeum*,
> *Et quae* cum *casiis cinnama mittit Arabs.*
> His oculis lyncis, renovataque *cornua cervi*
> *Et* candens refugo *concha relicta mari*,
> Neu teneam verbis animum, *miscentur* in unum
> *Singula Thessalici* quae docuere *magi.*[44]

[43] The words borrowed from ancient authors are italicized: represented are Tibullus, Ovid (*Meta.*), Propertius, Statius (*Silv.*), Martial, Virgil (*Ecl.*), and Horace (*Car.*) (see Sisler, "An Edition, 68–81).

[44] Sisler, "An Edition," pp. 60–61, lines 83–84. Sisler's translation reads as follows (85–86): "Afterwards, she secretly piles up the herbs of Circe which Pindos, Othrys, Olympus, and Athos had provided for her, and which the inner parts of Anthedonian Glaucus had tasted. Nor are herbs collected from Mount Rubrus lacking, nor those which renew you, bitten by a serpent, Galanthis, nor the tawny fibers of the Florentine crocus. To these are added the working of myrrh and Sabaean gum and twigs of cinnamon, which, with cinnamon bark, the Arabs send. Also added to these are the eyes of a lynx and the regrown horns of a deer, and a glistening white conch, left behind at low tide. And to make sure that I cannot keep my mind [as opposed to

In thirteen lines, Lovato intermingled lavish borrowings from a well-known work, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, with newly revived authors like Tibullus, Propertius, and Martial, and rare works by familiar authors, like Horace's *Carmina* and Statius's *Silvae*.[45]

Despite his apparently life-threatening illness, the young Lovato did not seek solace in Christianity. Sickness taught nothing and death meant only the cessation of life:

> Look at the earth flowering with so many thousands of young men: after a short time, the black day may overwhelm them. Nature overturns her own work and, restless, always fashions matter in new forms. We are mocked by the gods, creations of their hands, and we are not today what we were yesterday. So I want nothing except to enjoy happy times, and when sweet things are lacking, to die sweetly (lines 195–202).[46]

At times, Lovato struggled unsuccessfully to bend the language to his thought.[47] A few passages read like prose (e.g., lines 53–64). The work's antique facade was occasionally blemished by biblical references and, at one point, by the mention of Tristan wounded for love of Isolde (lines 221–22). The overall effect, however, was impressive. The vocabulary was classical throughout, the metric quantities were generally correct, and rhetorical figures were used with restraint.

In the first poem, Ovid was the presiding genius of Lovato's creation, from the opening section describing the ravaging fire of Lovato's disease (akin to the love pangs of the ancient heroines of the *Heroides*) to the elegiac character of the conclusion, where the poet, seeking consolation in his writing, invoked, among other examples, the scene of the exiled Ovid relieving his misery through song on the shores of the Black Sea:

Sisler, I read the phrase "Neu teneam animum" to mean "retain control"] through magic words, all the individual things which the Thessalian wizards taught are mixed into one."

[45] Sisler identifies the texts represented by the underlined words (pp. 73–75).

[46] Ibid., p. 66: "Aspice florentem iuvenum tot milibus orbem/ Quos breve post tempus merserit atra dies/ Versat opus natura suum, semperque figurat/ Materiam formis irrequieta novis/ Ludimur a superis, manuum factura suorum/ Nec sumus hoc hodie quod fueramus heri./ Nil igitur [cupio] quam laeto tempore fungi/ Et cum desierint dulcia, dulce mori." Translation is from Sisler, "An Edition," 90.

[47] For example, the image of death predicting that Lovato's prayers for death will be denied: "Invisus mihi sum; mortem precor; atra repugnat/ Antropos et vanas praecinit esse preces" (58, lines 39–40).

Naso Tomitana metro spatiatus in ora
Flebilis exilii debilitabat onus (lines 215–16).[48]

In the second poem, Ovid shared with Propertius the honor of providing the most subtexts.

With Lovato's poetic epistles, we move into another realm of sensibility from that found in the classicizing writing of his contemporaries, Urso and Stefanardo. The diction of their epics was more classicizing than that of twelfth-century Italian authors of the genre, but the genre remained traditionally medieval. Stefanardo's *De controversia hominis et fortune*, despite its formal classicizing, descended from a long line of twelfth-century French didactic poetry. But Lovato's letters of 1267/68 broke new ground.

It was the first Latin poem written by an Italian since late antiquity to employ classical diction for the expression of private thoughts and feelings. Henry of Settimello's *Elegia*, the only Italian medieval poem to approach the lyrical quality of Lovato's composition, began on a personal note, but the ensuing debate between the author and fortune ended by drowning out the voice of intimacy. By contrast, Lovato had no apparent didactic purpose in mind. If indeed he felt in danger of dying, he may have considered the poem articulating his suffering to his friend Compagnino a testimony to his literary promise. The second, shorter letter, written to the same correspondent as the disease abated days later, was equally personal in tone and equally classicizing. The two letters, along with two others by Lovato and one to him from another friend, Ugo Mezzabati, were included along with historical works of Justin, Pompeius Trogus, and Bede in a manuscript probably copied by Lovato himself, the BL, *Add.*, 19906.[49] Although none of the histories in the manuscript was rare in the Middle Ages, the marginal notes to Justin's *Epitome* indicate that the commentator matched the account given in the text to comparable passages in Livy's *Decades* I, III, and IV.[50] The third and fourth *Decades* were almost unknown in previous centuries, and Lovato's now lost manuscript of Livy, probably taken by him from the monastery of Pomposa, played a central role in the revival of Livy's work.

[48] Ibid., 67: "Ovid, walking around on the shores of Tomis, used to lessen the burden of his wretched exile with verse." Translation is Sisler's.

[49] Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 29–30.

[50] Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell'Umanesimo*, 2 vols. in 3, Studi sul Petrarca, nos. 9 and 11 (Padua, 1981), 1.1:6–10.

Lovato's manuscript of Seneca's *Tragedies* (BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 1769), created by him on the basis of the medieval "A" and the superior and hitherto neglected "E" version of Pomposa, served as a fundamental text in the revival of Seneca's works.[51] Lovato's brief essay on Seneca's complicated metric scheme in the plays, which was added at the end of his Seneca manuscript, was perhaps the first instance in the Middle Ages of analyzing the meters of an ancient author.[52] Besides citing in his poetry for the first time in perhaps three or four centuries the works of the elegiac poets Tibullus and Propertius, Horace's *Carmina*, and Statius's *Silvae*, Lovato also reintroduced Ovid's *Ibis* and Martial's *Epigrams* to western Europe.[53] Although we do not yet know the full extent of the role of his manuscripts and annotations in the textual tradition of ancient authors in the Renaissance, it can be said that his early poetry began the process of putting certain rare authors and texts back into circulation.

4

I have already connected Lovato's intention to model his poetry after that of the ancients to several sources, both general and particular. At

[51] See the summary of important scholarship on the two Senecan manuscripts in Manlio Pastore-Stocchi, "Un chapître d'histoire littéraire aux XIVe et XVe siècles: 'Seneca poeta tragicus,'" in *Les tragédies de Sénèque et le théâtre de la Renaissance*, ed. J. Jacquot (Paris, 1964), 19. See also Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 56–66.

[52] Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 56–66. Winfried Trillitzsch, "Die lateinische Tragödie bei den Prähumanisten von Padua," in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Önnerfors, J. Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner (Darmstadt, 1973), 454–55, incorrectly maintains that the Paduans were the first since late antiquity to recognize Seneca as both the philosopher and author of the tragedies. The fact was already known to Vincent of Beauvais, who included it in his discussion of Seneca in *Speculum historiale*, VIII, cols. 102–36. The tragedies are described in cols. 113–14. Cf. Pastore-Stocchi, "Un chapître d'histoire littéraire," 16. See ibid., 15, for other, prior references to Seneca as both dramatist and philosopher. Like Vincent, the Paduans thought that Seneca *moralis* and *tragicus* was one with his father, Seneca, author of the *Declamationes*. In his biography of Seneca, *Lucii Annei Senece cordubensis vita et mores*, Mussato wrote: "Fuit Seneca civilis scientie gnarus et causarum orator elegantissimus, quod edocet Declamationum suarum volumen, in quo causarum forme forensium subtili et decora discreptatione noscuntur" (Megas, *Kuklos Padouas*, 155-56).

[53] For the range of Lovato's references to the ancient poets, see Guido Billanovich, "'Veterum vestigia vatum' nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani: Lovato Lovati, Zambono di Andrea, Albertino Mussato e Lucrezio, Catullo, Orazio (*Carmina*), Tibullo, Properzio, Ovidio (*Ibis*), Marziale, Stazio (*Silvae*)," *IMU* 1 (1958): 155–243.

a general level, I have identified the Italians' largely unstated need to legitimize the unstable political and moral institutions of Duecento Italy by reaffirming the ancient roots of their culture and society. The renewal of interest in writing Latin poetry, beginning with Urso da Genova, derived both from that concern and from a new vogue for poetry, in the first instance French and Provençal poetry. Lovato surpassed other contemporary Latin poets not only in talent, but also in the competitive spirit in which he wrote. He made the Latin muse the rival of the vernacular.

Both the form and content of Lovato's work exhibit the influence of the *langue d'oïl* and the *langue d'oc*. The inclusion of Tristan among a series of ancient examples in the first letter to Compagnino only hints at the effect of epic French literature on the poet. At some time in his life, Lovato composed a Latin poem, of which only six lines survive, that celebrates the romance of Tristan and Isolde while incorporating parts of the narrative tradition connected with Lancelot. The project suggests that Lovato thought that the material could be more elegantly expressed in Latin than in French.[54]

Provençal poetry inspired Lovato and other members of his group to assume *seghals*, that is, sobriquets, for themselves: Lovato called himself *Lupus* (wolf) and Mussato took the name *Asellus* (Little Ass).[55] Lovato's letter of ca. 1290, to Bellino Bissolo, a Milanese who lived for some time in Padua in the 1290s, concluding with an apostrophe to the letter itself in the last two lines, is a borrowing from the

[54] Guido Billanovich, "Lovato Lovati," 139–42, provides the older bibliography on the poem found in BLF, Plut. 33, 31, fol. 46. The manuscript has recently been analyzed by Mary Louise Lord, "Boccaccio's *Virgiliana* in the 'Miscellanea Latina,'" *IMU* 34 (1991): 127–97. See also Robert Black, "Boccaccio, Reader of the Appendix vergiliana: The Miscellanea laurenziana and Fourteenth-Century Schoolbooks," in *Gli zibaldoni di Boccaccio: Memoria, scrittura, riscrittura, Atti del Seminario internazionale di Firenze-Certaldo (26–28 aprile 1996)*, ed. M. Picone and C.C. Bérard (Florence, 1998), 113–28. John Larner, "Boccaccio and Lovato Lovati," in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller* ed. Cecil Clough (New York, 1976), 22–32, does not believe the poem to be Lovato's. I am not convinced by his arguments, especially the one that rests on his belief that Lovato, a humanist, would have disliked French literature. As I have shown, while Lovato himself chose to write in Latin, he was not immune to the attractions of chivalric literature.

[55] Apparently an ass appeared on the escutcheon of the Mussato family: Luigi Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis, Bovetini de Bovetinis, Albertini Mussati necnon Jamboni Andreae de Favafuschis carmina quaedam ex codice veneto nunc primum edita: Nozze Giusti-Giustiniani* (Padua, 1887), 62.

Provençal *renvois*.[56] Several fourteen-line hexameter compositions, Latin versions of the vernacular sonnet form, are found among Lovato's later poems, while he and other members of the Paduan group were given to poetic debates probably inspired directly by the Provençal *tenzone*.[57]

Most importantly, however, Lovato's rivalry with the vernacular forced him to develop a poetic form alien to the narrow Latin verse tradition of northern Italy. More than seventy years before, Provençal influence had inspired Henry of Settimello to write the most strikingly personal lines of his generally sententious *Elegia*. Now driven to rival the personal – if formalized – voice articulated in the Provençal lyric, Lovato cast back to the ancient tradition for models he could imitate. Thence he appropriated not only techniques, but modes of expressing a range of nuanced attitudes and feelings. His discoveries had reverberations in his own psychic life. In the case of the two letters of 1267/68, finding the ancient equivalent of the erotic poetry of Provençal in Ovid and Propertius, the twenty-seven-year-old Lovato, unable, or, on the eve of his marriage, unwilling to write love poetry, shifted Ovid's violent language and imagery of amorous passion to a new object, the disease that was ravishing his own body. While long passages in the letters constitute heuristic imitations of poetic letters of Ovid and Horace, extensive fragmentary imitation is also evident. Lovato generally worked successfully at this level: the allusive counterpoint of ancient echoes rising from multiple subtexts did not generate disparity of motifs, but rather, controlled by the poet's voice, created *vetustas*, a temporal distancing imbedded in sounds and images evocative of ancient models. Had only the four poems of the BL, *Add.* 19906, survived as witnesses of his art, Lovato's devotion to the *veterum vestigia vatum* would be unquestioned.

Other writings of Lovato's, though, suggest that the development of the new aesthetic was not easy or incremental. The series of later,

[56] Incongruously, in letter 2, defending imitation of the ancients, Lovato's *renvois* (lines 106–07) borrows from the opening lines of the twelfth-century *De contemptu mundi* of Bernard de Morlas (Weiss, "Lovato Lovati," 17). See Sisler, "An Edition," 43.

[57] Medieval Latin poetry may also have been a source for dialogue poems presenting contrasting points of view. In Italy, both Boncompagno's *De amicitia* and Henry's *Elegia* could have served as models. They too, however, may have been influenced by the Provençal *tenzo*. For examples of sonnet-form poems, see Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, 1–4 and 26–27. Padrin based his edition on the single manuscript of these poems (BMV, *Lat.* Cl. XIV, 223 [4340]).

short poems produced by Lovato and members of his circle raise questions about the group's intention and ability to conform to the new aesthetic principles. While the poems of the British Museum group range in dates from 1267/68 to about 1292, the later poems have been assigned to the final decade of the Lovato's life. Those attributed to Lovato have morality or politics as their subject.

The opening lines of one of the political poems, that concerning the effects on Padua of the movements of Charles II of Anjou in central Italy, demonstrate the stylistic differences between this poetry and his earlier work:

> Quae sors immineat patriae si Francia Tuscos
> Vicerit aut victis exultet Etruria Gallis,
> Consulis, eventus dubii servator Aselle.
> Certus in incerto non sum, prudentia menti
> Tanta meae non est: non me sic implet Apollo
> Divinusque tepor, sed, quod per tempora vidi,
> Forsitan occulti res est praesaga futuri.[58]

There is nothing unclassical in the vocabulary here, and the reference to Apollo provides an antique association, but the concentrated use of assonance (*Vicerit/victis* and *Certus/incerto*), the unclassical use of *per tempora*, and the quasiparatactic structure of the lines reveal a medieval inspiration. Overall, the lack of intensity in the poem and the poverty of figurative language make it impossible to identify an ancient model for the composition.

This last observation may to a degree explain Lovato's having fallen away from the level of diction and inspiration found in the earlier poems. Whereas those poems were grounded primarily on the ancient poetic letters of Ovid and Horace, in the short later ones Lovato seems to have worked more independently, and he faltered.[59] His borrowings from ancient texts here minimally interact with a

[58] Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, 20 (poem 26): "Advise me, Little Ass, observer of an uncertain event, what destiny would threaten the *patria* if France were to conquer the Tuscans or if, with the Gauls conquered, Etruria were to exult. I am not certain in uncertain matters. My mind does not have such discernment. Apollo and divine heat have not thus inspired me, but what I have seen over time is perhaps a forecast of the hidden future."

[59] Lovato's letters of 1267/68 are both based on Ovidian epistles. Weiss insists on a Horatian substratum in the poem to Bellino because of the concern with literary questions (Weiss, "Lovato Lovati," 16). The letter to Mezzabati, with its opening consideration of epistolary form and its subsequent focus on the poet's current illness, represents a mixture of Ovid and Horace.

conceptual matrix, and the poems are distinguishable from prose only by their metric. The absence of an ancient model, not a desertion of his classical aesthetic in his last years, best explains the mediocrity of the late poems.[60]

Nevertheless, if in most of the poems in the collection Lovato does not appear to be forsaking his aesthetic ideal of "following in the footsteps of the ancient poets," but rather failing to attain it, in a few poems he seems willing to concede to a contemporary and rival aesthetic. He appears engrossed in word games, a preoccupation that reaches outrageous proportions in poem 27, wherein the poet revels in rhyme, assonance, and whimsy:

> Urbs opulenta viris et fertilis ubere glebae
> Quam non Hybla thymo, non aequent palmite Thebe,
> Optima lina ferens Sacci nascentia Plebe,
> Fons insignis equis vel te vel Arione, Thebe,
> Cum pulsata vicem non possis reddere, debe.[61]

The end rhyme in *–be* continues for ten more lines (*Thebe*, *plebe*, *debe*, etc.). Nonsense syllables ending in *–be* (*bebe*, *rebebe*, and *ebe*) abound. Similarly, poem 55, ascribed to Lovato, consists of ten lines, each of which ends in a single-syllable word terminating in x: *fax*, *pax*, *fex*, *rex*, *pix*, and so forth.[62]

Another concession to medieval taste occurs in an epitaph in two quatrains composed by Lovato for his own tomb and not part of the British Library manuscript. The second quatrain reads:

---

[60] Weiss, "Lovato Lovati," 20, explains the lack of *vetustas* in these letters thus: "... si può dire che molti di questi carmi appartengono, linguisticamente alla letteratura latina del primo umanesimo, ma spiritualmente a quella in volgare. Non c'è dubbio che un tale giudizio avrebbe colmato d'orrore il buon Lovato. Ciò tuttavia non elimina il fatto che nei carmi pubblicati dal Padrin, Lovato non scrive et non sente come un umanista ma come un rimatore politico-moraleggiante del primo Trecento." As I interpret Weiss, despite evidence to the contrary, Lovato thought he was remaining loyal to his earlier commitment to the ancients. It is difficult for me to believe, however, that he would not have recognized, at least in exaggerated instances such as the one above, the unclassical character of the poem.

[61] "City rich with men and fertile in the richness of its soil, which Hybla cannot equal in thyme nor Thebes in wine, bearing the flax of Plebesacco [a district near Padua], the finest growing, distinguished source of horses. Oh Thebes, since you cannot compare, surrender with yourself and Arion" (my translation of Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 21). All translations from these poems are mine.

[62] This poem (55) is ascribed to Lovato by Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 69, solely on the basis of its similarity to poem 27 in eccentricity.

Mors mortis morti mortem si morte dedisset
Hic foret in terris aut integer astra petisset,
Sed quis dissolvi fuerat sic cuncta necesse
Ossa tenet saxum proprio mens gaudet in esse.[63]

A poet with Lovato's stylistic sensibilities could not have been unaware of the unclassical exaggeration of assonance and rhyme. On the threshold of a new aesthetic, Lovato could not help reverting back to the old, from which he still derived pleasure. His epitaph suggests his uncertain grasp both of stylistic decorum and cultural otherness. Although a Christian, he insisted that D.M. (*Dis manibus*) and V.F. (*vivus fecit*) be inscribed on his tomb in accordance with ancient practice, the former after the first of the two essentially medieval quatrains and the latter after the second. Nevertheless, that in the early fifteenth century Pier Candido Decembrio plagiarized the second quatrain demonstrates that medieval tastes did not fade quickly.[64]

Lovato's shorter poems demonstrate the civic orientation characteristic of the Paduans. The moral and political concerns tying him to the civic tradition begun by Albertano, and infrequently mentioned in Lovato's earlier, more classicizing poetry, formed the subject matter of all his poems in the Padrin collection. The poems range from a curiously rhyming one-line sequence of proverbs (poem 54), to an exchange of poems with Mussato (poems 14–16) devoted to defining the nature of friendship.[65]

[63] "Had the death of death [Christ?] given death to death by [his] death/ This man would [now] be here on earth or, having his being whole, would have sought the stars. But for those [us] whose fate is necessarily to be disunited, so all things must be dissolved. The tomb holds his bones; his mind rejoices permanently in being." The Latin text of this inscription is published in Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 22. The first of the quatrains reads: "Id quod es, ante fui; quid sim post funera, queris;/ quod sum, quicquid id est, tu quoque, lector, eris./ Ignea pars celo, cese pars ossea rupi,/ lectori cessit nomen inane Lupi" (ibid., 21).

[64] Weiss, "Lovato Lovati," 21.

[65] Lovato's poem 55, *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 36 (see n. 62), consists of a collection of moralisms, e.g., "In sapiente viro, patrii firmaminis est vox" (line 8). The poetic exchange of letters (pp. 12–16) between Lovato's poems 14 and 16 and Mussato's poem 15 is devoted to answering two questions: "Quis vere sit amare potens, quis dignus amari" (line 8, p. 13). Essentially elaborations of Aristotle's discussion of friendship in book 8 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the poetic character of the poems is blunted by rough adherence to the Aristotelian text. While Aristotle's three species of friendship, based on the good, the useful, and the pleasurable, are obviously well-known to Mussato, he defers to Lovato to give the detailed exposition of the conception. Curiously, although Lovato declares that neither the *utile* or the *delectabile* is the "verae nexus amicitae" (poem 16, line 42), he excuses himself from discussing which of the three species is to be preferred.

Lovato's most interesting poetry dealing with moral questions belongs to his debate with Mussato over whether it is better to have children or remain childless (poems 1–10). After the exchange of ten poems, five ascribed to each writer, the agreed-upon arbiter, the Paduan notary Zambono di Andrea, delineated his reasons for awarding the victory to Lovato in a poem longer than the debate itself (poem 11). When Mussato, disgruntled with the decision, threatened to appeal the judgment to the Vicentine poet, Campesani, Zambono wrote a second poem justifying his judgment to Campesani (poem 12).[66]

As the debate comes down to us, both speakers focused on the practical effects of having children. The married but childless Lovato

[66] There exist two versions of this poetic debate. The first, published by Padrin, was based on the only codex then known, BMV, *Lat.*, Cl XIV, 223 (4340) (version A). The second (version B), based on the Leiden, Bib. Rijksuniversiteit, *B.P.L.*, 8A (L), was published by Francesco Novati, "Nuovi aneddoti sul cenacolo letterario padovano del primissimo Trecento," *Scritti storici in memoria di Giovanni Monticolo* (Venice, 1922), 180–87. Other manuscripts containing the work have since been identified. For a comparative discussion, see Carla Maria Monti, "Per la fortuna della *Questio de prole*: I manoscritti," *IMU* 28 (1985): 71–95. Besides many small differences between the two versions, B has fifty-four more lines than A, adding lines 133–84 and lines 206–15. Version L does not have the letter from Zambono to Campesani (Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, poem 12, pp. 8–11).

In Guido Billanovich's view, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 49, Mussato authored at least the first ten of the twelve poems. Enzo Cecchini, "La *Questio de prole*: Problemi di trasmissione e struttura," *IMU* 28 (1985): 97–105, demonstrates convincingly, however, on the basis of a study of metric and vocabulary, that the poems ascribed to each of the three in the Padrin edition are written by three separate individuals. Cecchini argues, 105, that Mussato's poem 13, 11–12, is not part of the debate. See Billanovich, "Il preumanisimo padovano," 46–49, for the contrary view.

At the same time, Cecchini suggests, "La *Questio de prole*," 103–05, that 52 of the added lines of L in Zambono's poem (Novati, "Nuovi anecdoti," 184–85, lines 133–84) contrast sharply in metric and language with the other lines attributed to him and may have been written by someone else, possibly by Benvenuto Campesani (104–05). The second addition, consisting of ten lines in B (Novati, "Nuovi anecdoti," 186, lines 206–15), Cecchini considers part of the poem intended for deletion by Zambono and inadvertently added by a copyist. Because it appears to represent the debate as originally presented by the three participants, I have chosen to employ the Padrin version for my purpose. Ettore Bolisano, "Un importante saggio padovano di poesia preumanistica latina," *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia patavina di scienze, lettere ed arti* 66 (1953–54): 67–75, publishes an Italian translation of poems 1–11 of the Padrin version.

The main difference between the texts of the Venice version (A) and the Leiden version (B) is that the additions of the latter endeavor to frame the debate in terms of a conflict between the contemplative and active life, a theme not otherwise raised by the debaters and possibly a revision inspired by Petrarchan humanism.

maintained that children were the source of fathers' grief, not happiness:

> Lycurgus, Neapulius, Evander, Priam, Nestor, and Creon bewailed the gift of children. I do not mention countless others.[67]

More generally, he argued that happiness was relative to the individual:

> Every lot is fortunate to him who considers it pleasing.[68]

In Mussato's view, the man with children was "loved by the stars" (poem 2, lines 10–11). He who was childless walked without support, "uncertainly feeling his way in a dark life" (poem 2, lines 13–14). Man naturally sought the continuity of his flesh (poem 4, lines 9–11) and desired his offspring to surpass him in prosperity and fame (poem 4, lines 13–14). Mussato denied that those who were ignorant of the true way to happiness could really be happy (poem 14, lines 1–3 and poem 6, lines 1–3). Should we fear to have children because they may turn out badly? Such an argument is analogous to fearing life because it ends in death.

> I really think that if someone has promised you victory, you will go up to the gymnasium, you will use the forum, you will strive with vigor, nor would you wallow around indolently in the stadium. Perhaps you alone among thousands will receive the crown. It has not been promised to the sluggish. Do not be the only one to despise eternal fame.[69]

Deciding not to have children out of fear for their fate makes one like the man who did not sow his fields for fear of the devouring birds.

In his poem rendering judgment, Zambono, after summarizing the two sides, awarded the decision to Lovato:

> Lupus sang true things, nor was Mussato able to defend himself rightly. The commonsense reasons he used to prove his point are able to be refuted exhaustively by intelligence.[70]

---

[67] Poem 3, lines 6–8, in Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 2: "... prolis flet dona Lycurgus/ Nauplius, Evander, Priamus, Nestorque Creonque/ Innumeros taceo."

[68] Poem 3, line 4, in ibid., p. 2: "Omnis enim sors est felix quae grata ferenti est."

[69] Poem 6, lines 9–13, in ibid., p. 4: "Jam puto si tibi sit victoria sponsa, palestram/ Ascendes, utere foro, nitere vigori/ Nec stadio volveris iners; de mille coronam/ Forsitan accipies unus: promissa iacenti/ non est. Perpetuam solus ne despice famam."

[70] Poem 11, lines 51–53, in ibid., pp. 7–8: "Vera Lupus cecinit nec se defendere Muxus/Iure potest, quamvis vulgi rationibus uti/ Quae satis ingenii possunt virtute refelli."

He appeared to speak from experience:

> If nature had given me a little plot of ground
> And also had deprived me of the vain honor of having children,
> What blessed, pleasant peace and happy life
> I would always have had.[71]

Accordingly, he ordered Mussato to provide a dinner for Lovato, and presumably for himself as well. Years later, when Zambono was living in exile at Chioggia for the deeds of one of his sons, he would have been even more certain of the truth of Lovato's opinion.[72]

Although a reviser of Zambono's discourse, perhaps living in the same century, represented him as casting the debate in terms of a conflict between the active and contemplative lives, the original never went beyond the this-worldly in justifying the judgment for Lovato. As a matter of fact, throughout the whole debate, while the poetic argumentation resonated with mythological and historical references to antiquity, Christian associations were notably absent. Furthermore, the one nonancient historical example invoked, that of the French kings, was immediately reintegrated into the ancient background:

> Anchises, ancestor and father of the race of Augustus and the line of French kings, which drew its origin from the family of Priam.[73]

Although he might have made capital out of Lovato's relativistic moral position, Mussato did not contest it.[74] This series, like a number of other short poems among those by Lovato and his circle, demonstrates that the tie between moral preoccupations and the

---

[71] Poem 12, lines 68–71: "O mihi si talem natura dedisset agellum/ Me quoque natorum vano privasset honore/ Quam felix quam grata quies, quam laeta fuisset/ Vita mihi semper."

[72] See poem 53, in Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, pp. 33–34, written in exile. Zambono died, still in exile, in 1315/16.

[73] Poem 4, lines 11–12, in ibid., p. 3: "Anchisem Augusti generis proavumque patremque /Francigenaeque domus seriem quam duxit in ortum Priamides ." In his poems Zambono, poem 11, line 34 (p. 7), refers to Mussato's citing examples of biblical kings, but no such citation is found in the existing texts of Mussato's poems.

[74] Novati's text ("Nuovi anecdotti," 184–86), lines 133–84 and 206–15, attributed to Zambono, contrasts the active and contemplative life. Children constitute one more impediment in the soul's search for heaven. There is nothing Christian here about the afterlife, which the soul attains through study (ibid., 185, lines 165–67): "Te faveant operosa quies et lucida cordis/ ingenia ut studio clarus pascaris ameno/ cognatoque animo volitans iungaris Olimpo."

study of ancient culture already constituted a major element in early humanist work.

For both Lovato and Mussato, however, political issues held perhaps more interest than moral ones did. Despite the physical suffering displayed in his first poem of 1267/68, the political situation of the moment intruded. On his sickbed, he worried about the effects on Padua of the battle shaping up between Conradin and Charles of Anjou.[75] Fortunately for Lovato, during most of his life, the city was able to pursue an aggressive policy of expansion. By 1267/68, both Vicenza and Bassano had become part of Paduan territory, and by the early years of the fourteenth century, with the absorption of the county of Rovigo, Padua dominated the Veneto.

In 1302, called on by Mussato's poem (poem 25) to predict the repercussions for Padua of the warfare between Charles of Anjou and some of the Tuscan cities, Lovato (poem 26) cautiously offered a prediction based on his general experience.[76] Because liberty only thrived in times of peace ("Libertas immota viget" [poem 26, 26]), he feared that the hostilities might awaken Paduan factionalism. As for his own conduct, "I, more sensibly, would choose to give my sails to no wind" (poem 26, 33). Recognizing the dangers of civic division as did Albertano da Brescia, Lovato presumably enshrined his opinion in his *De conditionibus urbis Padue et peste Guelfi et Gibolengi nominis*, a work about local factionalism that no longer survives.

The favorable position of the Paduan commune changed with the arrival of Emperor Henry VII from Germany in 1310. The restructuring of political power that the emperor helped engineer in the Veneto encouraged Verona's emergence as Padua's rival. Lovato had died by that time, but in his last years he seemed aware of the weakness of the Paduan commune. He may have taken the decisive defeat of the Paduan effort to rival the Venetian salt monopoly in 1304 as an omen. Perhaps Mussato's reminiscences in the *De gestis Italiae* referred to the uncertainty of this period:

---

[75] Sisler, "An Edition," 65: "Teutonicus reboet Boreali crudus ab Arcto/ Transeat hac sitiens Appula regna furor/ Excipiat rabiem Karolus metuendus ab Austro/ Et videant Ligures proelia pulchra ducum/ Marchia Tarvisii nitidis horrescat in armis." Lines 181–85 imply that Lovato did not yet know, when writing the poem, of Conradin's defeat by Charles of Anjou on August 23, 1268. Conradin's army left Germany in the second half of 1267. The date of the poem is probably sometime in the summer of 1268 (Sisler, "An Edition," 14).

[76] Mussato's poem is found in Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 19; Lovato's, ibid., pp. 20–21.

> Often, when we exchanged ideas with our companions in taverns, I recall the sage Lovato and his nephew Rolando saying that our city, continually growing heavier, labored daily with its greatness to remain stable for awhile, and that the aging order of affairs was slackening with the changing government of the world, and it [Padua] was less able on this account, mainly because it had grown so much.[77]

In any case, Lovato's poetry written in the aftermath of the Treaty of Treviso, signed in October 1304 to end the salt war with Venice, betrayed deep anxieties. In a poem addressed to Mussato around this time, Lovato wished to know whether in Mussato's opinion the peace was genuine or, because of unequal advantage given to Venice, it would provoke further animosity between the two cities.[78] Feeling that Padua had surrendered more, Lovato asked whether the city, resenting restrictions on its liberty, would not go to war again:

> For wounded liberty might be the cause of a second conflict. Because the nature of liberty, which grieves when compelled not to go its own way, needs a release from prison, nor does it want to be held oppressed, nor does it tolerate being despised; restless of serving, it sums up its strength and, incited by a hidden stimulus, more fiercely exercises its consuming fury.[79]

---

[77] Mussato, *De gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII Caesarem*, bk. II, ch. 2, in Mussato, *Opera*, 8: "Meminerimque ego Lovatum vatem Rolandumque nepotem, dum sepe in diversoriis cum sodalibus obversaremur, inquientes ut sic ingravescens iugiter, et in dies nostra civitas magnitudine laboraret sua, modicumque restare temporis, ut iam senescens rerum ordo, mutata universi politia, solveretur minusque eam posse hoc ipso, quod plurimum creverat." Note Livy, *Ab condita urbe*, Pref. 4, where Rome "eo creverit, ut iam magnitudine laboret sua." The historical works of Mussato were republished by Muratori, *RIS* 10. In that edition, the passage just cited is found in cols. 586–87.

Because the 1636 edition of Mussato's *Opera* contains a series of paginations, I present here a brief outline of the arrangement of the works:

(1) *Historia augusta*, fasc. 1, 1–94.

(2) *De gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII Caesarem*; a fragment of bk IX; *De obsidione*; *De traditione Paduae*; and a letter to Benzo: fasc. 2, 1–112.

(3) *Ludovicus Bavarus*: fasc. 3, 1–10.

(4) *Varia*: *Ecerinis*; *Epistolae*; *Soliloquia*; and minor poetic works: fasc. 4, 1–140.

On the editions of Mussato's historical works, see also 131, n. 41.

[78] Lovato, along with his friend Zambono, had been among the Paduans to sign an agreement of alliance with Verona against Venice on May 18, 1304: Paolo Sambin, "Le relazioni tra Venezia, Padova e Verona all'inizio del secolo XIV," *Atti dell'Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti* 111 (1952–53): 212.

[79] Poem 30, lines 21–27. Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, pp. 63–64, provides the historical background for poems 28–31, pp. 22–25. Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo," 51–52, has rearranged this exchange of poems between Mussato and Lovato as follows: poem 30 (Lovato), poem 31 (Mussato), poem 28 (Lovato), poem 29 (Mussato). He regards poem 27 (Lovato) as the final poem in the series.

The exchange that followed revealed the differing temperaments of the two men. While Mussato, in poem 29 deplored the unfavorable peace and the potential discord arising out of the Paduans' accusing one another of betrayal, Lovato urged calm (poem 28).[80] The matter of the salt marshes was a small one compared to the benefits of peace. "Peace, even a simulated one, is peace: often the true follows the feigned."[81] If Mussato wished to retain the respect of the people, he should pretend to be satisfied with the agreement. In reply, Mussato wrote a poem almost identical to Lovato's, but by changing a few words, he reversed the meaning. He argued that they should both proclaim their dissatisfaction with the treaty. Mussato's recalcitrant attitude helps explain why he spent so many years in exile.[82] Petrarch would not have understood the willingness of Lovato or Mussato to devote so much of their attention to what he would have considered the petty intrigues of contemporary communal life!

Similarly, the solitary Petrarch would have found the collective scholarly enterprise that Lovato led in an urban environment constraining on his freedom. We must resist the temptation to speak of Lovato's sodality as if it were some kind of school or academy. Although consumed by his scholarly interests, Lovato still earned his living as a notary and judge, and his time for study was limited. His encounters with friends took place not in a schoolroom but in the city's taverns, where, sitting at a table, accessible to all comers, he enjoyed talking about scholarship and politics.[83] Despite sharp differ-

[80] Mussato declares (poem 31) that he and Lovato feel alike about the treaty and shows himself reluctant to accept it: "Proinde ulula qui dulce soles ululare, Lycaon/ Unice mi curas comes et solamen in omnes/ Dic age: res patriae soli plorabimus ambo/ An simulemus eas taciti, virtute relicta/ Ut reliqui cives, turbae et numeremur inerti?" (lines 27–31, in *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 25).

[81] "Pax, simulata quidem, pax est: simulatio saepe/ Assequitur verum" (poem 28, lines 7–8, in *Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 22).

[82] Lovato's curiously medieval poem (27), referred to above, with its praise for the Paduan people and the city's rich lands, might well have been the concluding poem in the debate. Lovato may also have composed poem 51 (*Lupati de Lupatis*, p. 32) defending the Paduans against Zambono d'Andrea's charge of inconstancy: Weiss, "Lovato Lovati," 18. Guido Billanovich, "Lovato: L'epistola a Bellino," 149–50, refutes the tradition that late in his life Lovato himself was exiled by the Carrara. For a defense of the tradition see Silvana Collodo, "Un intellectuale del basso medioevo italiano: il giudice-umanista Lovato di Rolando," *IMU* 28 (1985): 216–19.

[83] See above, where Mussato refers to the conversations of Rolando da Piazzola and Lovato on the life-cycle of their city. See also Mussato's preface to his *Evidentia tragediarum Senece*, dedicated to Marsilio Mainardini (Marsilio of Padua), in which he says that the work was designed to answer questions raised by Marsilio about

ences in their approaches to poetry, both Latin and vernacular, Lovato enjoyed intense conversations with Bellino Bissoli. Lovato also had friends such as the doctor, Zambonino di Bartolomeo, a man without apparent literary interests.

While Lovato had charge of the education of his own nephew, Rolando da Piazzola, Mussato seems not to have been directly affected by Lovato's teaching until the younger man was late in his teens.[84] As for Mussato's formal education, in later years he identified Buonincontro da Mantova, whom he had known since his youth, as his teacher.[85] Nevertheless, Buonincontro himself, like the Paduans Zambono di Andrea and Ugo Mezzabati, had also probably fallen under Lovato's influence, so that the intellectual milieu in which Mussato matured would have been at least indirectly shaped by Lovato's presence.[86]

5

The intense concern for ancient literature and history in Padua that marked the years around 1300 was not all Lovato's doing, nor was it

---

Seneca's tragedies as they talked in taverns. The treatise is published by Megas, *Kuklos Padouas*, 123–31. The dedication to Marsilio is found on 123.

[84] I have not seen Giacinto Girardi, *Rolando da Piazzola* (Padua, 1929). Rolando's interest in epigraphy is discussed by Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo," 99–106. The same author identifies Rolando's contribution to Lovato's Senecan manuscript, BAV, *Vat. lat.* 1769, 57–62. Guido Billanovich, "Il Cicerone di Rolando da Piazzola," *IMU* 28 (1985): 37–47, considers Rolando's annotations on a manuscript of Cicero. Rolando also authored a small treatise, now lost, entitled *De regibus*: Paolo Marangon, "Marsilio tra preumanesimo e cultura della arti: Ricerca sulle fonti padovane del I discorso del *Defensor pacis*," in *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare*, 385.

[85] Mussato, *Epistolae*, 13, lines 17–18, in *Varia*, *Albertini Mussati ... alia quae exant opera*, 63, praises Bonincontro: "Laudibus a nostris numquam reticende magister/ O, mea quem coluit prima iuventa, vale." On the possible identity of this Bonincontro with Bonincontro di Bono da Mantova, also known as Bonincontro di Nicolò dei Bovi da Mantova, who lived in Venice from 1314 to 1346, see Violetta de Angelis, "Un carme di Bovetino Bovetini?" *IMU* 28 (1985): 60–61, n. 10. In her article, de Angelis publishes a poem sent to Mussato from a certain Bovetino, who may be Bovetino Bovetini (d. 1301), archpriest of the Paduan cathedral and canon lawyer. He, then, would be another member of Lovato's circle.

[86] *Epist.*, 1, lines 26–55; Sisler, "An Edition," 26–27, refers to his two dearest friends, Ugo Mezzabati, a lawyer, and Zambonino di Bartolomeo, a physician. On Mezzabati, see Foligno, "Epistole inedite," 40. On Zambonino, see Sabbadini, "Postille," 259; Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 41–42; and Marangon, "Il trattato *De conservatione sanitatis*," in *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare*, 351.

restricted to his inner circle. The elaborate preface of Marchetto da Padova to his treatise on music, *Lucidarium* (1315), with its phalanx of citations from ancient Latin writers, may not reflect a profound knowledge of the actual texts, but it does indicate what credentials Marchetto considered appropriate for establishing his authority in his field.[87] Although thoroughly medieval in genre and diction, the *florilegium* of the Paduan judge Geremia da Montagnone (1250/60–1320/22), *Compendium moralium*, composed in the first years of the fourteenth century, displayed knowledge of a wide range of ancient authors. His writings contain citations from biblical, patristic, and medieval sources.[88] Geremia, a member of Lovato's communal guild, may have called on Lovato to supply him with rare texts, but Geremia's classification of the poets prior to approximately 600 C.E. as *poetae* and all those after as *versilogi* (versifiers) probably was of his own devising and reflected a widely diffused awareness among learned circles in the Veneto of the superior quality of ancient literature.

For long periods late in Lovato's life, Padua played host to two Ferraresi scholars, each in different respects highly gifted. Riccobaldo of Ferrara (1251–1318), the author of a series of histories, spent at least two periods of exile in the city: first in 1293 and again in 1305–08. Already the author of a universal history entitled *Pomerium* and a series of shorter works, during his four years in Padua he wrote his

[87] Born in Padua ca. 1275 and choirmaster of the cathedral at least between 1305 and 1307, Marchetto left Padua in 1308. Although his important musical treatises, *Lucidarium in arte musicae plane* (1309–18), *Pomerium* (ca. 1319), and the later *Brevis compilatio in arte musice mensurate*, were all written after his departure, he received his musical training in the city. For descriptions of the treatises, see F. Alberto Gallo, "Il trattatistica musicale," *SCV* 2:471–72. Gallo (473–76) and Pierluigi Petrobelli, "La musica nelle cattedrali e nelle città, ed i suoi rapporti con la cultura letteraria," *SCV* 2:457–68, demonstrate the continuing importance of Padua as a musical center after Marchetto's departure. The *Lucidarium* is found in *The Lucidarium of Marchetto of Padua*, ed. and trans. J.W. Herlinger (Chicago, 1985) and the *Pomerium* is published by Giuseppe Vecchi, Corpus scriptorum de musica, no. 6 (Florence, 1961). For the *Brevis compilatio*, see Gallo, "Il trattatistica musicale," 472, n. 10.

[88] Roberto Weiss, *Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo* (Rome, 1949), 15–50, and Berthold L. Ullman, "Hieremias de Montagnone and His Citations of Catullus," in his *Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Rome, 1973), 79–112. Although Weiss believes Geremia died early in 1321 (17), Paolo Marangon, "Le origini e le fonti dello scotismo padovano," in *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare*, 186–87, n. 50, finds him still alive in 1322. Geremia authored two other major works: *Summa commemorialis utilium iuris* and *Compendium de significatione vocabulorum medicorum* (Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 22–24). On Montagnone and Catullus, see Julia H. Gaisser, *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers* (Oxford, 1993), 18.

Historiae, which, like the *Pomerium*, was a universal history but one which placed more emphasis on the ancient Roman period than its predecessor. A third major work, *Compendium Romanae historiae*, probably composed mostly at Verona in 1317–18, summarized the material covered in the *Historiae*.[89]

Riccobaldo likely had friends in Lovato's circle during his two residences in the city. Riccobaldo may already have been acquainted with Livy's fourth *Decade* before his arrival in Padua in 1293, but during his second, longer sojourn, he studied Livy intensively and became interested in relatively neglected ancient authors like Josephus and Justin.[90] The writings of Riccobaldo's last fifteen years indicate an increasingly critical faculty and a reluctance to take medieval authorities at their word. Nevertheless, while Riccobaldo's histories reflect humanist tendencies, his fidelity to a medieval genre of historical writing and apparent lack of interest in expressing himself in classicizing style make him more like Geremia da Montagnone than like Lovato.[91]

Another scholar from Ferrara, Pace, who taught logic and grammar in the *studio* around the beginning of the century, was more attuned to the interests of Lovato's Paduan circle. While in Padua, he composed at least two long poems. *Descriptio festi gloriosissime Virginis Marie*, the first, written about 1299/1300, was dedicated to the doge of Venice and provided a fulsome description of one of the major

[89] For a general biography of Riccobaldo, see Augusto Campana, "Riccobaldo da Ferrara," *Enciclopedia dantesca*, 2nd rev. ed., 5 vols. and append. (Rome, 1984), 4:908–10. The chronology of Riccobaldo's compositions is discussed by A. Teresa Hankey, *Riccobaldi ferrariensis: Compendium romanae historiae*, FSI, no. 108 in 2 pts. (Rome, 1984), 1:xi–xxii; and in greater detail in her *Riccobaldo of Ferrara: His Life, Works and Influence* (Rome, 1996). For the date of the major works, see ibid., 3–6, and the substantial analyses of manuscripts that follow. Dating of the minor works is found on 49, 51, and 85. The *Compendium* marks an advance in scholarship over the *Historiae* in that whereas the *Historiae* relied heavily on Vincent of Beauvais in the Roman section, Riccobaldo now uses the ancient Roman historians directly where he can (Hankey, *Riccobaldo of Ferrara*, xv).

[90] Hankey, *Riccobaldo of Ferrara*, 5, notes how the *Historiae* abandon the previously strong dependence on Jerome, Orosius, and Eutropius. Despite the increased importance of ancient historians in this work, however, Vincent of Beauvais provides the basic structure. By contrast, in the *Compendium* not only is Vincent's guidance absent but the proportion of Roman history to the rest of the volume increases: Hankey, *Riccobaldo of Ferrara*, 75. Giuseppe Billanovich, *La Tradizione del testo di Livio*, 1:20–32, believes that Riccobaldo's knowledge of Livy was directly related to his presence in Padua, but see Hankey, *Riccobaldo of Ferrara*, 119–21.

[91] His periods are short and generally paratactic. The only classicizing feature is his frequent use of the ablative absolute.

festivals of the city. The second, written about 1302/04 for the newly elected bishop of Padua, Pagano della Torre, celebrated the recovery of Milan by members of the bishop's family in 1302.[92] In later years, with his *Evidentia Ecerinidis*, an *accessus* to Mussato's play, the *Ecerinis*, he helped transform Mussato's *Ecerinis* into a school text.

The classicizing character of both Pace's poems points to the influence of Lovato's aesthetic principles. His efforts to enhance the use of the *Ecerinis* for teaching purposes show him eager to contribute to the scholarly and literary innovations championed by the Paduans. In fact, the dedicatory verses of Pace's poem for Pagano assert the novelty of classicizing poetry. While claiming to have inherited the mantle of Homer and Virgil, Pace presents himself as a "new poet" composing "new verses":

> O you, Goddess, once wondrously celebrated by Homeric song, brought by Virgil from the Aonian mountains to Latium and long venerated by gifted poets when, O Calliope, you as a sacred being inhabited the houses of Romulus and the Caesarian fortresses, and were well-known on the stage and distinguished for your tragedies ... hide yourself no longer; take up the pick of the sweet-sounding harp and deign to bind the hair of a new poet with the living leaf .... Accordingly, be willing to invent new verses full of grave melody, and place me, led by your oar, in a calm port, I pray, and provide power to the singer.[93]

The centrality of Seneca's tragedies in Pace's view of Roman literature is a sure mark of Paduan influence.

While Pace's surviving poetry bears the stamp of Lovato's aes-

---

[92] The best discussion of Pace and his works is found in Stadter, "Planudes," 137–62. The most recent edition of the *Descriptio* is E. Cicogna, *La festa delle Marie descritta in un poemetto elegiaco latino da Pace del Friuli* (Venice, 1843). The poem dedicated to Pagano is edited by L.A. Ferrai, "Un frammento di poema storico inedito di Pace dal Friuli," *Archivio storico lombardo*, 2nd ser., 10 (1893): 322–43. For the *Evidentia Ecerinidis* see Megas, *Kuklos Padouas*, 203–05. Cf. Stadter, "Planudes," 150–52. Pace's commentary, on Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* indicates that he also taught this work in a *studio*. On the manuscript of the commentary, see Stadter, "Planudes," 149–50; and for its continuing importance over the next centuries, see Marjorie C. Woods, "A Medieval Rhetoric Goes to School – And to the University: The Commentaries on the *Poetria nova*," *Rhetorica* 9 (1991): 61–64.

[93] Ferrai, "Il frammento," 330–31, lines 6–11, 15–17, and 22–23: "Tu, Dea, Maeonio quondam celeberrima cantu/ Aoniis educta iugis, ducente Marone/ In Latium, doctisque diu venerata poetis/ Romuleas dum sacra domos arcesque teneres/ Caesareas, scenis famosa, et nota cothurnis/ Calliope .../ Non ultra latuisse velis; assume sonorae/ Plectra chelis, vatisque novi dignare virenti/ Nectere fronde comas .../ Ergo novos dignare gravi modulamine versus/ Fingere, meque tuo deductum remige portu/ Siste, precor, placido, viresque impende canenti."

thetic teaching and marks him, along with Mussato, as one of the second generation of Italian humanists, he was never mentioned by anyone in the group of Paduan humanists and was probably not an intimate member of their circle. The narrative-descriptive character of his two surviving poems locates his work more in the epic tradition, which had monopolized the modest production of northern and central Italian Latin poetry throughout the twelfth century. The epic genre, always more or less dependent on ancient epic models, and already rendered more consistently classical by Urso and Stefanardo, achieved greater *vetustas* thanks to the diction and metric of Pace.

Mussato's large corpus of extant writings includes a long epic-like poem, but the focus of composition among the Paduans was on other kinds of poetry. In his early compositions, Lovato created a poetry open to personal feeling and private meditation. Although the later poems had a political or didactic character, their brief, largely conversational nature usually preserved a tone of intimacy. Lovato's expansion of the range of possible expression brought to the fore long-neglected ancient models for imitation and in turn opened the way for the poet to capture within himself the moods and feelings that he identified in the newly significant texts. Compared with Lovato's work, sometimes muddled by conflicting tastes and sometimes lacking a suitable model, Pace's compositions seem monochromatic; they offered limited potential for the future.

When Lovato was at his best, no one in his generation or in the next rivaled his grasp of the music of ancient verse and its texture of feeling. Petrarch did not lightly praise a modern poet: for him, Lovato's appeal would have resided in the music of his verses, evocative of antiquity, and in his intimate voice. Lovato's classicizing style, moreover, was anchored in a new scholarship, characterized by increased knowledge of authors and texts and by a philological sophistication surpassing that of any medieval Italian scholar. Lovato was largely responsible for making Seneca the most important classical author for the next generation of humanists. A scholar with exceptional social gifts, Lovato insured that his own philological and artistic accomplishments would be carried forward by a group of disciples upon whom he impressed the need to weld one's learning to the service of political justice and moral truth.

CHAPTER FOUR

ALBERTINO MUSSATO AND THE SECOND GENERATION

On his deathbed, according to Giovanni del Virgilio, Lovato bestowed on Albertino Mussato his reed pipes, saying, "Since you are deemed gifted by the muses, by these will you be muse-inspired. Ivy will circle your temples."[1] Del Virgilio thus symbolically identified Albertino Mussato as Lovato's poetic heir. In their last encounter, Mussato himself tells us, Lovato not only charged his middle-aged disciple to continue pursuing the new art of poetry, but instructed him to set the interests of the commune before those of his family.

> Why in your last admonishment did you tell me to love the common welfare after God and order me to put the interests of my sweet children after that of the motherland and to prize its welfare before that of my living father?[2]

The events of Mussato's life suggest that he took Lovato seriously on all counts.

---

[1] The relevant lines are found in the poetic letter sent by Giovanni del Virgilio to Mussato: Philip H. Wicksteed and Edmund G. Gardner, *Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio* (Westminster, 1902), p. 190, lines 208–18. The citation in the text is found on lines 217–19: "Quia musis cerneris aptus/ his Musatus eris. Hederae tua tempora lambent." He learned of Lovato's last hours from Lovato's nephew, Rolando da Piazzola (ibid., p. 190, line 210), who was an assessor of the *podestà* of Bologna in 1319 or 1323 (ibid., 126). All translations of Mussato's writings are mine.

[2] In a letter to Rolando, Mussato relates his sorrow at Lovato's death: "Hei michi flende pater, vitae pars maxima nostrae/ cassus amicitia quo pereunte fui!": Mussato, *Epistolae*, 3, lines 31–32, in *Opera*, fasc. 4, p. 45. In his discussion of friendship (Luigi Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis, Bovetini de Bovetinis, Albertini Mussati necnon Jamboni Andreae de Favafuschis carmina quaedam ex codice veneto nunc primum edita: Nozze Giusti-Giustiani* [Padua, 1887], Poem 31, p. 25, lines 27–28), Mussato wrote: "Lycaon/ Unice mi curas comes et solamen in omnes." In the metric exchange on the Treaty of Trieste, ibid., Poem 15, p. 13, lines 1–2, Mussato invokes Lovato: "Dulce rogas, o sola meae solatia vitae/ Mi Lupe ...."

Addressing the deceased Lovato in the letter to Rolando da Piazzola, Mussato asks rhetorically: "Cur mihi supremo monitu communia dixti/ post cultum summi iura colenda Dei?/ Iussisti patriae dulces postponere natos/ et patriam vivo praeposuisse patri?" (*Epistolae*, 3, p. 45, lines 37–40).

1

Presumably born the illegitimate son of a Paduan aristocrat, Mussato (1261–1329) raised himself from poverty by his talents to become one of the most powerful figures in the last years of Padua's commune. Contemporaries described him as short in stature, with a healthy complexion and an agile body. He was pleasing in his carriage, an indefatigable worker, discreet in his living habits, eloquent in speech, and blessed with a good memory. A formidable figure, he was the last and most gifted defender of Paduan communal liberty.[3]

Much of what is known of Mussato's early life comes from an extraordinary poem entitled *De celebratione suae diei nativitatis fienda vel non* (Whether his birthday ought to be celebrated or not), written in 1317, when Mussato was 56 years old. At the outset, he gave his age and located himself precisely within the broad sweep of time:

> If my parent truly told me the right time, one thousand three hundred and seventeen new vintages have been closed in jars since the birth of God.[4]

More than fifty years later, Petrarch, imitating Suetonius, would provide greater detail about the day of his own birth, but Mussato was the first person whom we know of since antiquity to celebrate his birthday.[5] The commemoration was significant: by measuring out his life in years, Mussato increased his ability to organize memories and structure his identity, thus intensifying his consciousness of the association between the course of his life and the flow of human history.[6]

---

[3] The description is given by the commentators on the *Ecerinis*, Guizzardo da Bologna and Castellano da Bassano: *Ecerinide: Tragedia*, ed. Luigi Padrin (Bologna, 1900), 72–73.

[4] Mussato, *De celebratione suae diei nativitatis fienda vel non*, in *Opera*, fasc. 4, p. 81, lines 3–6: "Sexta dies haec est, sunt quinquagesima nobis/ (Tempora narrabat si mihi vera Parens)/ Musta reconduntur vasis septemque decemque/ Nunc nova post ortum mille trecenta Deum."

[5] Saints' days were celebrated in the liturgical calendar, but the celebration commemorated the anniversary of the saint's death and not her or his birth. While not celebrated, the birthdates of great lords and princes were surely known, but I doubt that most of them knew the date and hour of their births precisely enough to eliminate guessing when it came to casting their horoscopes.

[6] The new precision in measuring an individual life was but one aspect of a broader European concern for greater precision in measuring time. Another was the invention of the mechanical clock. Carlo Cipolla, *Clocks and Culture, 1300–1700* (London, 1967), 40–41, lists the chronology of the installation of mechanical clocks, beginning with Milan in 1309. Padua's public clock was installed in 1344. The

Raised in abject poverty (*in statu pauperiore*), he barely received an elementary education. The death of his father when Mussato was not yet fourteen forced him to copy books for students in order to care for his younger brother and sister. Although it may have been a difficult life, he nonetheless considered it in retrospect "a safe means of living." "A happy poor boy," he had only hunger to fear, "not fame, nor arms, nor envy, which devours all things."[7] Later, motivated by desire for money, he sold his services in the law courts: "in this art, purchased at a price, I rented my words."[8] He must have gained a reputation for brilliance early, because when he was only thirty-five, he was made a knight by the commune and entered the city's government.

From that point forward in his narrative, Mussato became less specific, but we know certain details of his adult life from other sources. Because he lacked the advanced studies necessary to become a judge, he remained only a notary. His exceptional oral talents enabled him to serve as *causidicus*, a role for which he had no formal preparation. His speech to the arts faculty of Padua, a year after his coronation as poet in 1315, implies that for a time at least he taught at the *studio*. But the major occupations of his adult life were politics and communal service.[9] He became a member of the Council of a

---

increasing bureaucratization of Italian city-states, especially where age requirements were imposed for holding offices, contributed directly to the importance of keeping track of individuals' ages. Yet the celebration of a birthday was apparently still rare in the fifteenth century, when Poggio Bracciolini remarked, as if it were exceptional, that he had just celebrated his birthday, as Salutati had done in his lifetime: *Opera omnia*, ed. Riccardo Fubini, 4 vols. (Turin, 1964–69), 3.1, 305–06.

Dante's statement that he first met Beatrice when they were both nine years old and that they met again for the first time at eighteen (*Vita nuova*, in *Opere minori*, ed. Domenico de Robertis and Gianfranco Contini, vol. 1.1 [Milan and Naples, 1995], 28–30 and 35) is regarded as having been dictated by numerological considerations, and as probably not based on fact.

[7] *De celebratione*, p. 81, lines 27–32: "O labor extremus, sed vitae tuta facultas!/ O felix mixta conditione miser!/ Sola fames nostro suberat ventura timori,/ Ille licet mordax, sed timor unus erat./ Non tuba, non gladii, non qui vorat omnia livor/ Actibus instabant invidiose meis."

[8] Ibid., p. 82, line 45: "Arte sub hac emptus pretio mea verba locavi."

[9] Nancy Siraisi, *Arts and Sciences at Padua: The Studium of Padua before 1350* (Toronto, 1973), 48–49, argues for a close connection between Mussato and members of the faculty of Padua's *studio*. I would go further and maintain that he was himself a member of the faculty of arts. His first letter is addressed to the members of the college as his *consortes studii* (1, lines 50–51; 40): "Vos quoque consortes studii mea dona Magistri/ Cum simul exorto grata referre Deo." Outlining the plays of Seneca, his letter suggests that he intended to teach the plays in a course in the *studio*. In his letter of dedication to the Venetian doge, he describes himself as *artis poetice professor* (see below, 139).

Thousand in 1296; he also served outside the city in 1297 as *podestà* of Lendinara (in Paduan territory), and in 1309 as one of the Executors of the Ordinances of Justice in Florence. Diplomatic missions took him to Boniface VIII in 1302. He traveled to the itinerant court of Henry VII in northern Italy three times in 1311 and 1312 and to the court of the Duke of Austria in 1325. In 1314, he served in Paduan military operations against Cangrande della Scala, lord of Verona, and, wounded and captured by Cangrande's men, spent several months in a Vicentine prison. When not traveling abroad, he worked indefatigably in the public assemblies, in the face of mounting pressures to create a signorial regime in the city.

The last half of his autobiographical poem was devoted to self-recrimination: desiring money and power, he had delivered himself into the hands of volatile fortune. His efforts had met with failure, and his poem concluded with the wish to celebrate no more birthdays, for they would only furnish him with further opportunities for adding evil deeds to his already heavy tally. Writing in 1317, Mussato had not experienced the full extent of fortune's ill favor. He had already been driven out of Padua for a short period in 1314, and in 1318, a year after writing the autobiographical poem, he left Padua again for a few months on orders from Jacopo da Carrara, who was acting temporarily as lord of the city. Banished permanently in 1325 by the Carrara family, who again exercised suzerainty in the city, he died in Chioggia in 1329. The year before his death, at the instigation of the Carrara, Padua surrendered to Cangrande, who in turn made Jacopo Carrara his vicar there. Padua never regained its freedom.

Autobiographical accounts were rare in the medieval period, and the *De celebratione*, although related to the confessional tradition, appears directly inspired by Lovato's very personal autobiographical poetry, especially the early poetic letters. Like Lovato's lyrical poetry, Mussato's *De celebratione* lacked the didactic character often associated with the confessional genre. The poet's lament against treacherous fortune and the bankruptcy of his days is too general to trace back to specific influences, but the contrast that runs through the poem between the dangers of public office and the safety of a humble private life is Senecan.

The extreme pessimism of the poem, which extended to the poet's prospects for a better afterlife, was surely the poet's own:

> Let Death, the messenger of a better life, approach, but I will then be a shade (*umbra*) within his domain.[10]

Hope of Christian afterlife was undercut by the reference to the shadowy denizens of the pagan underworld. No footing seemed solid enough to the middle-aged poet to permit a next step. Born illegitimate and poor, Mussato had fought his way to prominence by what might not always have been virtuous means. Consequently, as he looked back at fifty-six, despite conspicuous past success, whatever stability he had achieved remained mortgaged to a future largely beyond his control. While Mussato's literary expression of his inner turmoil cannot compare with Petrarch's in the *Secretum*, one may wonder to what extent the Florentine owed a debt to the Paduan for his own introspective orientation.

At various points in his writings, as, for example, in his use of the *seghal*, Mussato revealed signs of sentimental allegiance to a rival aesthetic. We do not see him betraying the new aesthetic as egregiously, however, as Lovato did. Despite its sonnet-like form of fourteen lines, reflecting vernacular influence, Mussato's composition dedicated to Henry VII (Poem 33), written in 1311/12, melded heterogeneous motifs drawn from its subtexts into a consistent classicizing voice in meter, language, and image:

> Anxia Cesareas sese convertit *ad* arces:
> *Romulidum* veteres occubuere *patres*.
> Suspicis Adriacis dominantem fluctibus urbem?
> *Praemia* castalio sunt ibi nulla deo.
> Occidit in *terris*, *si* quis fuit *em[p]tor Agavae*,
> *Et Maecenatem* non habet ulla domus.
> Territus effugio *pennati* stagna *caballi*:
> Judicat infirmas has Galienus aquas
> Cumque vetet princeps immunes esse poetas,
> A *Tritone rubri* me trahit unda *Tagi*.
> Frons, Henrice, mee satis est incomta Camene,
> Lecta tamen veri nuntia fida soni.
> Et michi grata tamen; saltem quia reddet amicum
> Me tibi, sulcandum iam bene stravit iter.[11]

---

[10] *De celebratione*, p. 83, lines 99–100: "Mors licet accedat melioris nuntia vitae/ nostra tamen iuris tunc erit umbra sui."

[11] Padrin, *Lupati de Lupatis*, 26–27. The poem may have originally been longer than fourteen lines. The first word, *anxia*, has no referent in the poem, but probably modifies *musa* or, in the mode of the Paduan humanists, *musula*. Perhaps Mussato thought the noun would be obvious to the reader. The English translation is as follows: "My anxious muse looks toward Caesarian heights; the ancient Roman

Although using exploitative imitation generously in this poem, absence of an ancient model for his own creation made it difficult for him to achieve *vetustas* on his own. In his tragedy *Ecerinis*, based on Seneca and performed in 1315, he came much closer to attaining that effect.[12]

For two generations of humanist writers, Seneca was the most highly regarded among ancient authors. By citing him frequently, Albertano da Brescia had promoted him as a great ancient moralist, but the reputation of Seneca as *tragicus* began with Lovato. For Lovato and his circle, the plays of the Stoic philosopher constituted the most inspiring texts of the ancient heritage. Mussato's Senecan *Ecerinis* marked the highest literary achievement of the Paduan circle and played a major role in exporting the ancient author's work beyond the Veneto. Seneca would also provide the basis for Geri d'Arezzo's reform of the private letter (see ch. 5). To judge from the surviving writings of Pietro da Moglio in the next generation (d. 1383), Seneca's tragedies served as basic reading texts in the prestigious teacher's university courses in Padua and Bologna. That Coluccio Salutati's manuscript of Seneca's plays is the only manuscript extant in his own hand indicates that it early became part of his library, when he was unable to pay an amanuensis to do the

---

fathers have gone to their rest. Do you mistrust the city dominating the waves of the Adriatic? There are no prizes there for the Apollonian god. If someone has purchased Agave, he has died on land, and no house has a Maecenas. Terrified, I flee the swamp of the winged horse. Galen considers these waters dangerous to the health. And since a prince refuses to give immunity to poets, the wave of the red Tagus draws me from Athens. The brow of my song, O Henry, is rather rough; yet it is read as the faithful messenger of true sound and is pleasing to me; at least, because it will give me as a friend to you, it has already laid open the way to be plowed." Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanisimo padovano," *SCV* 2:53–54, provides all but one of the sources for the italicized words. According to Billanovich, the authors included Statius, Juvenal, Martial, and Fulgentius. I do not see as he does (55, n. 204) the references to Catullus. To the authors he cites, I would also add Propertius for line 10, *rubri ... Tagi*. In *Epistolae*, 4, p. 48, line 6, Mussato writes: "Quaeritur in *rubro* splendida *gemma Tago*," drawing on Propertius, I.14.12: "et legitur *rubris gemma* sub aequoribus."

[12] There are a number of editions of Mussato's *Ecerinis*. I have chosen to use that of Luigi Padrin, *Ecerinide*. See also Mussato's *Priapeia* and *Cunneia*, which have Virgil's priapic poetry as a model. Mussato's poems are edited by Vincenzo Crescini, "Note e appunti," *Giornale degli eruditi e dei curiosi* 5 (1885): 125–28. Carmelo Calì shows that the two works were written before 1309: "I priapea e le loro imitazioni," in his *Studi letterari* (Turin, 1898), 65. The *Priapeia* is republished in Manlio Dazzi, *Il Mussato preumanista, 1265–1329: L'ambiente e l'opera* (Venice, 1964), 178–80.

work.[13] One of Petrarch's major innovations was to introduce Cicero as Seneca's rival for the position of prime pagan author of prose.[14]

Seneca's moral writings exerted tremendous influence on early humanists concerned with ethical problems. His meditations resembled Christian teachings closely enough to render credible the forged correspondence between him and St. Paul that circulated in Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but Christian identifications with Seneca's writings counted little for pre-Petrarchan humanists. Their high regard for the tragedies stemmed, rather, from the profuse moral instruction they found encoded in the writer's aphoristic language. The lessons taught by Senecan tragedy – his portrayal of the miseries of life, the instability of fortune, and the grim fate of those who transgressed universal law – revitalized the moralists of the period. The dialogue of the plays, with its capacity for revealing individual psychologies, fascinated them. No other ancient Latin writer known to them equaled Seneca's force in describing powerful human personalities infused with a demoniacal energy.

Lovato's intense interest in the plays, furthermore, was sparked by Padua's own recent experience with Ezzelino, whose viciousness and arrogance matched those of Seneca's tyrants. As presented by Rolandino, who felt overawed by him, Ezzelino was a monstrous force, dominating the life of the Veneto for decades. His fall required a massive, coordinated effort on the part of his various enemies. For Lovato, not only did Seneca's plays have powerful contemporary resonance, but they also reassured him that, despite the present ascendancy of evil, a divinely ordained balance in the universe would ultimately bring justice.

The Paduan humanists had no clear conception, however, of tragedy as a literary genre distinct from epic. Mussato reflected the confusion in his *Vita Senecae*, where he described tragedy as a suitable vehicle for narrating "the glories, falls, and deaths of kings and lords," because it was capable of expressing "the greatest sorrows,

[13] See my *Hercules*, 17. Da Moglio's attraction to Seneca is shown by two ten-line poems, each composed of one-line summaries of the plots of the ten tragedies: Giuseppe Billanovich, "Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro da Moglio, Francesco da Fiano: Scuola di retorica e poesia bucolica nel Trecento italiano," *IMU* 7 (1964): 291–98.

[14] Petrarch prized Seneca not only as a moralist but also as a poet. He says of Seneca's plays that "apud poetas profecto vel primum vel primo proximum locum tenent": *Rerum familiarium*, book IV, letter 16, in *Familiari* 1:195.

joys, and other passions of the soul."[15] He explained that tragedy took two forms: the first dealt with the "fall and disaster of great kings and princes"; the second, with "the open fields of battle and triumphal victories of kings and exalted lords."[16] His own tragedy reflected his confusion of genres.[17]

2

The *Ecerinis* was designed as political propaganda.[18] Recently released from Cangrande della Scala's prison, Mussato returned to Padua with a mission. By depicting the career of Ezzelino da Romano and providing a psychological portrait of the tyrant, Mussato intended to warn his fellow citizens of the threat posed by Cangrande to themselves and their families. Ezzelino, who had governed Padua among his other dominions from 1237 to 1256, furnished ample material for the purpose. Even younger members of Mussato's Paduan audience

[15] "[Seneca] sumpsit itaque tragedum stilum poetice artis supremum apicem et grandiloquum, regum ducumque eminentiis atque ruinis et exitiis congruentem .... Proprius enim per trageda carmina exprimuntur et representantur summe tristitia, gaudia et alie passiones anime": *Lucii Annei Senece Cordubensis vita et mores*, in Megas, *Kuklos Padouas*, 159.

[16] "Dicitur itaque tragedia alte materie stilus, quo dupliciter tragedi utuntur: aut enim de ruinis et casibus magnorum regum et principum, quorum maxime exitia, clades, cedes, seditiones et tristes actus describunt – et tunc utuntur hoc genere iambicorum, ut olim Sophocles in Trachinis et hic Seneca in his decem tragediis; aut regum et ducum sublimium aperta et campestria bella e triumphales victorias – et tunc metro heroyco ea componunt, ut Ennius, Lucanus, Virgilius ac Statius ...." (ibid., 160). Cf. Joseph R. Berrigan, "Early Neo-Latin Tragedy," in *Acta conventus neo-latini lovaniensis: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Louvain, 23–28 August 1971*, ed. J. Ijsewijn and E. Kessler (Louvain, 1973), 85–86.

[17] Mussato's title for his tragedy, *Ecerinis*, indicates that he was thinking in epic terms, on the analogy of *Thebais*, *Achilleis*, or *Aeneis*, rather than *Thyestes* or *Oedipus*: Wilhelm Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Komödie und Tragödie im Mittelalter*, 2 vols. (Halle, 1890-92), 2:68. That Mussato considered the *Thebais* a tragedy indicates that he did not understand tragedy and epic as separate genres. Cloetta refers to the play as "ein Epos ... in senecaische Kleider gehüllt." Cf. Manlio Pastore-Stocchi, "Un chapître d'histoire littéraire aux XIVe et XVe siècles: Seneca poeta tragicus," in *Les tragédies de Sénèque et le théâtre de la Renaissance*, ed. J. Jacquot (Paris, 1964), 28; and Winfried Trillitzsch, "Die lateinische Tragödie bei den Prähumanisten von Padua," in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Önnerfors, J. Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner (Darmstadt, 1973), 452–53.

[18] Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," *SCV* 2:64, n. 252, provides an ample bibliography on discussions of this play.

would have known the story, which had become something of a local myth. The contemporary reference is clear when in the *Ecerinis*, lines 174–76, a messenger lashes out against Verona:

> O, Verona, always the ancient scourge of this march, dwelling-place of enemies and road to wars, seat of tyranny.[19]

On the second anniversary of the presentation of the *Ecerinis* in 1316, Mussato specifically associated his tragedy with those of Seneca. Referring by implication to the difficult metric scheme used by Seneca and analyzed by Lovato, he wrote:

> On fire with the heat of tragedy, my mind drew difficult rhythms to its meters. The sisters of Boethia favored these same efforts, but only one Muse called me to the tragic genre. I do not know which she was, but she was prey to frenetic iambs, and it was tragedy that gave out the meters.[20]

He followed with a brief plot summary of the ten tragedies assumed by the Paduans to have been composed by Seneca, as if the Senecan tragedies constituted the entire ancient corpus of the genre.[21] Only the tragic meter, Mussato wrote, could celebrate such material (lines 91–97, p. 41):

> The greatest heights are celebrated in this kind of meter. A song will not be noble unless it treats of nobles. The voice of the tragic poet fortifies souls against calamities; paralyzing fear is cleansed, and perseverance always wins out against adversities. He does not possess it [the voice] whose heart is inexperienced in difficulties.[22]

Apparently, Mussato considered his own disillusionment with his political career a sufficient credential for composing tragedy. Having resolved to write of the da Romano family, he concluded, he had had no choice but to do so in Senecan meters (lines 127–28, p. 41):

---

[19] Padrin, *Ecerinide*, 34: "O, semper huius Marchiae clades vetus/ Verona, limen hostium et bellis iter/ Sedes tyranni."

[20] *Epist.*, 1, p. 40, lines 67–72 (addressed to the *Collegium artistarum* of the Paduan *studio*): "Verum equidem mea mens tragico succensa calore/ Traxit difficiles ad sua metra modos./Haec eadem Aoniae faverunt vota Sorores/ Unaque me ad Tragicum Musa vocavit opus./ Nescio quae fuerit, rabidis flagrabat Iambis/ Quique minstrabat metra cothurnus erat."

[21] He knew indirectly of Greek tragedy but denied its influence on him (ibid., p. 42, lines 133–36).

[22] "Per genus hoc metri fastigia summa canuntur/ Non nisi nobilium nobile carmen erit./ Vox tragici mentes ad contingentia fortes/ Efficit, ignavus deluiturque metus/ Vincit in adversis semper constantia rebus/ Non habet hanc, illis qui rude pectus habet."

> Thus I was not able to speak otherwise of your tearful descendants, O violent family of the Ezzelini.[23]

The formal aspects of the *Ecerinis* – its division into five acts, its frequent use of choruses, and its complicated metric scheme – are all Senecan. The object of a study by Lovato, the scheme required iambic trimeter for the dialogues and a pattern of sapphic, adonic, and anapest for the chorus.[24] Like Seneca, Mussato relied on messengers to report action occurring offstage, but he failed to observe the unities of action, place, and time that Seneca had generally observed. After dealing with the final defeat of Ezzelino in Act 4, Mussato devoted Act 5 to the destruction of the rest of the family. The five acts encompassed a period of at least twenty-four years, and the location of the scenes – often vague – shifted frequently.[25] The deviations from the unity of time and space were probably not intentional but rather resulted from a failure to identify those features as typical of the Senecan plays.[26]

The major themes of the *Ecerinis* paralleled those of Seneca's works. Borrowing from the *Thyestes*, lines 391–92, Mussato warned of the danger of seeking power (lines 118–19, p. 30):

> At what risks do you seek the heights of treacherous power?[27]

and from the *Agamemnon*, lines 72–73, the danger ever threatening the tyrant (line 257, p. 38):

> Always watchful, he fears and is feared.[28]

Like Seneca, Mussato cautioned (lines 136–45, pp. 31–32) that the

---

[23] "Sic ego non valui lachrimosos pandere partus/ Saeva tuos alio strips ecerina modo."

[24] Lovato's analysis of the meter is found in *Nota domini Lovati, judicis et poete Patavi*, in Megas, *Kuklos Padouas*, 105; and that of Pace, "Evidentia Ecerinidis edita per magistrum Pacem" in ibid., 203–04.

[25] Cloetta, *Beiträge*, 2:62–67.

[26] It should be noted, moreover, that *Hercules oetaeus* and the *Octavia* take place over more than one day. (Mussato considered the latter an authentic work of Seneca's.)

[27] "Quo discrimine quaeritis/ regni *culmine lubrici*." Compare with Seneca's "Stet quicumque volet potens/ aulae *culmine lubrico*." I am citing Seneca from *Seneca's Tragedies*, ed. F.J. Miller, 2 vols. (New York, 1917), 2:122. The parallels found in the following discussion of the *Ecerinis* are taken from Cloetta, *Beiträge*, 2:54–57; and Hubert Müller, *Früher Humanismus in Oberitalien: Albertino Mussato: Ecerinis* (Frankfurt-am-Main and New York, 1987), 73–74 and 96–176.

[28] "Pervigil semper *timet*, et timetur." This is a reworking of *Agamemnon*, lines 72–73; 2:8: "*Metui* cupiunt/ *metui*que *timent*."

people were unstable and their favor quickly subject to change.[29] Although those were traditional themes, Mussato's depiction of the wheel of fortune and man's inability to control his future (lines 146–47 and 432–35) probably came directly from Seneca.[30] In both authors, divine succor was invoked to punish the evildoers, but whereas in Seneca, fate was the overarching power in the universe, in Mussato, following Boethius, final authority belongs to a personal God.[31]

Numerous parallel passages are found between the *Ecerinis* and various Senecan plays, but Mussato's play most closely follows the *Thyestes*. The story of internecine conflict between two princely brothers, unrestrained in their pursuit of power, proved a rich source of inspiration for Mussato's depiction of Ezzelino. The *Ecerinis* pays its particular debt to the *Thyestes* from the early sections of the first act. The Da Romano castle (*Ecerinis*, lines 9–12, pp. 23–24) is unmistakably the fortress of Pelops, father of the two brothers, Atreus and Thyestes (lines 641–47, 2:144):

> A fortress sits on an ancient hill that for ages has been called Romano. Columns raise the roof to the heavens and on the south the house meets a tower, where it is open to the winds and all airy forces of destruction."[32]

When Ezzelino implores his mother to speak out (lines 18–19, p. 24),

> Speak out, mother: it pleases to hear anything great and what is bestial,

and she replies (lines 19–22, p. 24),

---

[29] Compare with *Thyestes*, lines 351–52; 2:120; *Hercules furens*, lines 169–71; 2:16; and *Octavia*, lines 877–81; 1:482.

[30] Compare lines 146–47; 32: "Sic semper *rota volvitur*/ durat perpetuum nichil" with Seneca's *Oedipus*, line 252; 2:448: "qui tarda celeri saecula *evolvis rota*"; or his *Hercules furens*, lines 178–80; 1:16: "properat cursu/ vita citato volucrique die/ *rota* praecipitis *vertitur* anni." To the opening of the chorus's speech (lines 432–35; 52): "O *fallax* hominum praemeditatio/ Eventus *dubii* sortis et inscia," compare the beginning of the chorus's speech in *Agamemnon*, lines 57–59; 2:8: "O regnorum magnis *fallax*/ Fortuna bonis, in praecipiti/ *dubio*que locas nimis excelsos."

[31] For appeals, see *Ecerinis*, lines 163–66; 33; and 228–80; 37. See the long appeal in the *Ottavia*, lines 222–51; 2:428. On fate, see, for example, *Oedipus*, lines 980–94; 1:514–16; and *Hercules furens*, lines 864–74; 1:76.

[32] "*Arx* in excelso sedet./ Antiqua colle, longa Romanum vocat/ aetas: in altum porrigunt *tectum trabes*/ *Premi*que turrim contigua *ad austum domus*/ Ventorum et omnis cladis aëreae *capax*." The *Thyestes* reads: "In *arce* summa Pelopiae pars est *domus*/ conversa *ad austros*, cuius extremum latus/ aequale monti crescit atque urbem *premit*/ et contumacem regibus populum suis/ habet sub ictu; fulget hic turbae *capax*/ immane *tectum*, cuius auratas *trabes*/ variis columnae nobiles maculis ferunt."

> Alas, the nature of the dastardly crime is overwhelming! I can almost see the vision of the deed before me,

the words echo the *Thyestes*, lines 633 and 634–36, 2:144.[33] Adelheita's realization that she is pregnant with the devil's child draws almost word for word on the sensations of Thyestes after unknowingly eating his sons (*Ecerinis*, lines 51–53, p. 27):

> But alas Venus too insistent, received within, burned within, instantly attacking my vital organs.[34]

The horrifying description of the devil–rapist in the form of a bull (lines 39–50), however, is based not on Seneca's *Thyestes* but on his *Hippolytus* (lines 1036–54, 1:402–03).[35]

Segments of the *Ecerinis* imitate heuristically extensive passages of specific plays, but, more broadly, Mussato succeeded in capturing the generic character of Senecan tragedy throughout much of the play. Admittedly, lapses in language and imagery occasionally marred the classicizing surface of the poetry, but, overall, Mussato succeeded in enhancing dramatic effect by setting a contemporary series of events into a frame that evoked the real and mythological tyrants of antiquity.

At the same time, the *Ecerinis* expressed in a sustained manner the commitment to civic life that Paduan humanists had previously articulated in a series of brief, eclectically styled poems. In Mussato's hands, the citizens, a new dramatic presence, emerged in the Senecan political universe of princes and mobs. Even though they

---

[33] Ezzelino: "*Effare* genetrix, grande *quodcumque* et ferum *est*/ audire iuvat." Adelheita: "Heu me nefandi criminis/ stupenda qualitas! Quasi ad *vultum* redit/ *imago facti*." The passages from the *Thyestes* read: Chorus: "*Effare* et istud pande, *quodcumque est*, malum." Nuntius: "Si steterit animus, si metu corporis rigens/ remittet artus. Haeret in *vultu* trucis/ *imago facti*!"

[34] "Sed heu recepta pertinax nimium Venus/ incaluit *intus viscera exagitans* statim/ *onus*que *sensit* terribile venter tui." Cf. *Thyestes*, lines 999–1000: "Quis hic tumultus *viscera exagitat* mea?/ Quid tremuit *intus*. *Sentio* impatiens *onus*/ meumque gemitu non meo pectus gemit."

[35] Mussato writes, lines 39–46; 26: "Haud *taurus* minor./ Hirsuta aduncis cornibus *cervix* riget/ setis coronant *hispidis* illum *iubae*:/ Sanguinea binis *orbibus* manat lues,/ ignemque *nares* flatibus crebris *vomunt*:/ Favilla, *patulis auribus* surgens, salit/ ab ore; spirans os quoque eructat levem/ *flammam*, perennis lambit et barbam focus." Seneca's monster in *Hippolytus* is depicted as follows: "Quis habitus ille corporis vasti fuit!/ caerulea *taurus* colla sublimis gerens/ erexit altam fronte viridanti *iubam*;/ stant *hispidae aures*, *orbibus* varius color,/ .... hinc *flammam vomunt*/ oculi, hinc relucent caerula insignes nota;/ opima *cervix* arduos tollit toros/ *nares*que hiulcis haustibus *patulae* fremunt."

were assigned the passive role of observers, through their presence the chorus of citizens invited the Paduan audience to identify with the action. Lamenting the mob's fickleness, the chorus in Act I also bewailed their own unstable nature:

> Oh how often we and the vilest rabble support the many intrigues of the powerful (lines 134–35, p. 31)![36]

The anguish experienced by the chorus at the messenger's report of Ezzelino's capture of Padua again linked the citizens' destinies to the city (lines 219–20, p. 36):

> A noble land, Padua, subverted for a price, obeys a tyrant: Ezzelino now holds the scepter.[37]

Three hundred lines later, the revolt of Padua signaled the beginning of the fall of Ezzelino, who, unable to retake the city, murdered eleven thousand Paduan prisoners in his dungeons. His own destruction inspired the chorus to proclaim the restoration of order to the city (lines 529–32, p. 59):

> Let us now all enjoy peace together
> And let every exile be recalled in safety.
> To his own hearth may each be restored
> In possession of peace.[38]

Despite the civic fervor expressed throughout the play, Mussato remained unclear as to what constituted Paduan freedom. The word *libertas* never appeared in the text and its importance for Mussato can only be assumed from his emphasis on the tyranny that destroyed it. In their bitter denunciation of the noble factions, which allowed Ezzelino to come to power in the Veneto, the chorus never alluded to communal government as an alternative to tyranny or as the proper object of allegiance. Mussato's own political activity, nonetheless, testified to his belief that communal government was the guarantor against tyranny.

---

[36] "Nos et scandala cordibus/ plebs villissima iungimus!" For a similar separation, see lines 252–53: 38: "Plebe cum tota populus subegit colla ...."

[37] "Eversa terra nobilis pretio iacet/ parens tyranno Padua: iam sceptrum tenet."

[38] "Pace nunc omnes pariter fruamur/ omnis et tutus revocetur exul./ Ad lares possit proprios reverti/ pace potitus."

3

The commune of Padua in 1315 crowned Mussato as poet laureate for two works, his *Ecerinis* and the *Historia augusta*, also known as the *De gestis Henrici septimi Cesaris*, which chronicled Henry VII's Italian expedition between 1310 and 1313. With the revival of what they understood to be an ancient ritual for honoring a poet, the Paduan leadership endeavored to respond in kind to Mussato's use of classicizing style.[39] Just as the *Ecerinis* has come to be regarded as the first monument of humanistic imitation in poetry, so the *Historia augusta* furnishes its prose counterpart. For the first time the aesthetic criterion of imitation that Lovato had established for poetry was extended to prose. Through the *Historia augusta* Mussato endeavored to lend dignity and significance to the contemporary political life in which he himself had actively participated.

In his preface to a later historical work, *De obsidione Domini Canis Grandis de Verona circa moenia paduanae civitatis et conflictu ejus* (Of Cangrande's Besieging the Walls of the City of Padua and of Its Fight), composed shortly before his final exile in 1325, Mussato depicted the intellectual milieu in which he had produced his prose history. Written in compliance with the wishes of the Palatine Society of Paduan Notaries, the epic poem *De obsidione* recounted Cangrande della Scala's failed attempt to capture Padua by siege in 1320. According to Mussato in his preface, the notarial guild had frequently importuned him with requests to put into metric form the history of Cangrande's bellicose relationship with Padua that he had already

[39] Already by 1317, the *Ecerinis* was honored with a detailed commentary by two masters presumably teaching in the *studio*, Guizzardo da Bologna and Castellano da Bassano: *Ecerinide*, 69–247. The opening sentence of the commentary reads: "Commentum super tragoedia Ecerinide editum a magistro Guizzardo Bononiensi trivialium doctore et Castellano Bassianense artis gramaticae professore ab aliisque artistis examinatum et probatum" (67). By writing his *Evidentia Ecerinidis*, Pace da Ferrara also helped to make it a school text. On Castellano, see L. Paoletti, "Castellano di Bassano," *DBI* 21 (Rome, 1978), 639–41; and Lino Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell'umanesimo in Venezia* (Geneva, 1930), 16–17. After his return from exile to Padua in 1318, Mussato wrote Guizzardo, who apparently had left the city by then, asking Guizzardo to return a copy of Virgil that he had lent him: (*Epistolae*, 14, p. 64). Guizzardo was in Florence by August 1320 and taught in the newly created *studio* there at least until March 1, 1322. The *studio* itself probably ceased to function after 1324: see bibiliography in Francesco Novati, *Indagini e postille dantesche: Serie I* (Bologna, 1899), 113, n. 84. Notes for some of his lectures are found in BAV, *Otto.*, 3291.

written in prose (i.e., his *Historia augusta*).[40] But they had also imposed conditions on the language to be used:

> whatever it is, the language should not be in the high style of tragedy, but sweet and within the comprehension of the common people. And just as much as our history, on a higher plane with its more elevated style, can serve the educated, this metric work, bent to the service of a simpler muse, can be of pleasure to notaries and the humble cleric. For usually one is delighted by what one understands. One rejects what one does not comprehend because it is boring.[41]

[40] He must already have composed some of his *De gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII Caesarem*, designed to chronicle events in Italy subsequent to the emperor's death. In its existing form down to the last part of bk. XIV, the work goes to 1321, but he is known to have completed XIV and a chapter of a fifteenth book. Dazzi speculates that the work extended to 1325 (Dazzi, *Il Mussato preumanista*, 80).

[41] The publishing history of this work is complicated. Pignoria, editor of the 1636 edition of Mussato's works considered the *De obsidione* part of the missing books of Mussato's *De gestis Italicorum* (*DGI*). Having access to only the first seven books of the *DGI* and a short fragment of the ninth book, the editor added the poem as books 9–11, and made the fragment of the ninth book the eighth book. He included the *De traditione Padue* as the twelfth book.

Subsequently, Muratori republished the historical writings of the earlier edition with some additions, corrections, and further notes, in *RIS* 10, 10–783. Books 8 to 14 of *De gestis Italicorum* were only discovered in the late nineteenth century and were published separately by Luigi Padrin: *Sette libri inediti del De Gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII di Albertino Mussato*, Monumenti storici pub. dalla r. Deputazione veneta di storia patria, 3rd. ser. (Cronache e diarii), 3 (Venice, 1903). Both the editors of the 1636 edition and Muratori neglected to number the verses of *De obsidione*, but because Muratori's edition in *RIS* 10, cols. 687–714, provides a better indication of the location of lines, I shall refer to it in the following discussion of the *De obsidione* and, for the sake of consistency, in all references to Mussato's historical writings in the rest of the chapter. An Italian translation of Muratori's bk. X was done by Giuseppe Gennari, *Il libro X della storia di Albertino Mussato recato in versi italiani per le auspicatissime nozze Gaudio-Biasini* (Padua, 1863). On manuscripts and editions of Mussato's historial writings, see Manlio Dazzi, "Il Mussato storico nel VI centenario della morte di Albertino Mussato," *Archivio veneto* 59 (1929): 431–42.

I cite the prose preface of the poem in full (Muratori, X, col. 687): "Percontamini me frequens, importunius. quam opportunius instans, Notariorum Palatina Societas, jam seposita in literas exitia nostrae urbis, quae in illam divinis humanisque favoribus per haec tempora intulit Canis Grandis, quae et post versis satis versa sunt contrariis successibus in auctorem, ad vestrum civiumque solatium in quempiam metricum transferre concentum, hoc postulationi vestrae subjicientes, ut et illud quodcumque sit metrum, non altum, non tragoedum, sed molle et vulgi intellectioni propinquum sonet eloquium, quo altius edoctis nostra stilo eminentiore deserviret historia, essetque metricum hoc demissum sub camoena leniore notariis, et quibusque clericulis blandimentum. Plurimum enim unumquemque delectat, quod intelligit, respuitque fastidiens, quod non apprehendit. Illud quoque Catonis, qui de moribus censuit, in exemplum adductis, quod L. Annaeo Senecae imputatur opusculum. Quod quia plane grammate vulgari idiomati fere simillimum sanctiores sententias ediderit, suaves popularium auribus inculcavit applausus. Et solere etiam inquitis

The guild's insistence on an accessibly written text suggests that Mussato's prose history of the years 1310–13, for which he had been crowned, had been incomprehensible to the average Paduan notary, judge, or cleric, even though each was, at a certain level, Latin-literate.

As the preface continued, the author reported that in their desire for a comprehensive historical work, the notaries and judges had included a reference to the *Disticha Catonis*, a work attributed to Seneca. Because it spoke of morality in a Latin close to the vernacular, its dicta were "more holy" and were therefore more willingly accepted by the people. Mussato continued paraphrasing their appeal:

> Moreover, you say that the great deeds of kings and generals are accustomed to be translated from various languages into vernacular words with measured syllables and feet in order that they may be understood by the people and communicated by singing in theaters and on rostrums.

Therefore, he concluded, being unwilling to refuse their request,

> crude with the crude, I will comply in a popular way as the matter demands, using the heroic meter as well as I can.

But Mussato did not totally acquiesce to the demands of his public. Writing in Latin rather than in the vernacular, he used a classicizing but relatively spare style, lacking the *Ecerinis*'s almost continuous interweaving of ancient subtexts.

It may seem strange to the modern reader that a Latin-literate audience would find an epic poem easier to understand than a prose history. The reason lay in the way Latin was taught. Medieval teachers of grammar followed the ancient practice of teaching their subject through poetry, but medieval grammar students, unlike their ancient counterparts, did not speak Latin as a native language. Over the centuries, a collection of reading texts, primarily in verse, had been introduced to bridge the gap between the introductory grammar course in the rules of grammar and the reading of great ancient literature. The reading texts would almost always have included

---

amplissima regum ducumque gesta, quo se vulgi intelligentiis conferant, pedum syllabarumque mensuris variis linguis in vulgares traduci sermones, et in theatris et pulpitis cantilenarum modulatione proferri. Nihil ergo recusandum disponens, quod vestra deposcat amica suasio, fratribus meis annuens, qua licet et sciero, heroico usus metro, exigente materia populariter morem geram rudis ego cum rudibus."

Cato's *Disticha*, along with works like Prosper of Aquitaine's *Epigrammata*, Aesop's *Fables*, the *Dittochaeon* of Prudentius, and the *Physiologus*.[42] Although teachers may have chosen from as many as ten or eleven popular texts, the whole group was usually referred to as the *Octo auctores*. Besides strengthening the students' command of Latin, the *Octo auctores* was also intended to reinforce their moral fiber, perhaps in anticipation of the potentially corrupting influence that later reading in the ancient poets might exert.

Once having completed the *Octo auctores*, the twelfth- and thirteenth-century northern European student of grammar proceeded to the Roman poets. For much of the medieval period the readings were limited to Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and Lucan, and occasionally Juvenal or Statius. In contemporary northern and central Italy, however, students rarely got this far before they enrolled in some program of professional education. Even though most of the earliest Italian humanists were autodidacts as far as classical literature was concerned, their grammar-school reading, limited to the *Octo auctores*, gave them solid preparation for writing classicizing poetry. The same thing could not be said for their prose training in *dictamen*, which did not prepare them for writing – or reading – classicizing prose.

The program of instruction explains why the first efforts to classicize in the second half of the thirteenth century were limited to poetry and why these efforts attained a measure of success. By the end of the Augustan age, the techniques for composing in pentameter and hexameter had already been established, enshrined especially in the writings of Virgil and Ovid. Those two meters dominated medieval teaching of *ars poetica* and accounted for much of medieval Latin poetic literature, the *Octo auctores* included. In the medieval classroom, students were taught to analyze not merely a composition's content, but also its formal aspects, such as metric and rhetorical figures. Such exercises were applicable to the study of ancient verse.

Once resolved to classicize, the humanists could draw on that training to produce their own poetry. Through mnemonic exercises, they could easily isolate and internalize ancient poets' verbal patterns

[42] Paul F. Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600* (Baltimore and London, 1989), 114, lists the textbooks of late-ancient and medieval origin included under this title. Paul F. Gehl, *A Moral Art: Grammar, Society, and Culture in Trecento Florence* (Ithaca and London, 1993), analyzes these books and others commonly in use.

and imagery, which they were then free to rework into creations of their own. The more flexible syntactical constructions of poetry also made it possible for poets to classicize without a firm grasp of ancient prose syntax. Those Italians who set out to make ancient style their own first tried to do so in poetry both because their grammar-school training encouraged them to do so and because imitating poetry happened to be intrinsically easier.

Even so, Mussato's public would perhaps not have understood much of his *De obsidione* on first hearing or even on first reading. In the case of the initial public performance of his much more difficult *Ecerinis*, the audience knew the general plot and most would have spent their time during the performance interpreting what the mimes were doing, while the resounding, impressive sounds of the poetry swept over them from the podium.[43] In fact, to be fully understood, the play needed the glosses of Pace, Guizzardo, and Castellano.[44]

The preface of the *De obsidione*, however, conveyed the author's conviction that this poem was to be at least eventually accessible to his audience. Educational curricula are notoriously conservative, and, if by 1320 formal training in ancient literature was still restricted to the *studio* and exceptional grammar schools, few in Mussato's audience of Paduan notaries and "humble clerics" would have had the opportunity to study ancient poetry. If he sincerely intended to fulfill his promise to compose a history that they could enjoy, he must have been counting on their traditional training in the *Octo auctores* to render the epic poem intelligible to them.

While the average Paduan notary or cleric might be expected to appreciate the epic hexameter because of his grammar-school training, he remained largely ignorant of ancient prose and classicizing imitations like the *Historia augusta* because the study of prose did not

[43] For the contemporary conception of how a play was presented, see Giosuè Carducci, "Della *Ecerinide* e di Albertino Mussato," in Padrin, *Ecerinide*, 253–54.

[44] Benzo of Alexandria lamented the difficulty that modern readers had in understanding ancient Latin literature: "... modernis temporibus sic ars metrica in dissuetudinem venit ut nec eam moderni fere amplectentur immo paucissimi authorum maxime antiquorum metrice vix possunt absque multis commentis et glosis ad intellectum comprehendere (-hendi)." Conscious of the difference between ancient and modern style, Benzo continued: "Sane cum antiquorum latinum sermonem contemplor et dum quam dissimile sit a moderno eloquio considero ... vere video adimpletum quod dudum predixit Oracius ... 'multa renascentur' ...." (cited in Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:135, n. 44). On the date of Benzo's work, consult Rino Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," *SCV* 2:117.

form part of a fully developed grammar curriculum in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. That does not mean that the study of prose was neglected, but rather that it was largely identified with *ars dictaminis*. In twelfth-century secondary schools in northern and central Italy, training in prose composition was the major focus of education, while poetry was neglected. In the next century, even where headway was made in teaching ancient poetry, *ars dictaminis* still occupied a key place in the school curriculum.

Long established as the fundamental approach to prose composition, *ars dictaminis* constituted a major obstacle to the introduction of classicizing prose. The fragments of Lovato's surviving prose, for instance, indicate that, as a prose writer, he was deeply wedded to medieval *ars dictaminis*. The remnants of his prose found in the BL, *Add.* 19906, are highly worked exemplars of the standard parts of the medieval prose letter, that is, the *salutatio*, *exordium*, *narratio*, *petitio* and *conclusio*.[45] Lovato's style is generically aulic and linguistically medieval, with heavy reliance on *colores*. Probably inspired by Hohenstaufen and papal documents composed in the first half of the century, the examples reflect the author's preference for a *stilus altus* form of *dictamen*, the most elevated and difficult form.

By Lovato's generation, though, the ambitious stylistic adventures in *ars dictaminis* popular in earlier decades of the century, especially at the papal and imperial courts, had lost their appeal for most writers.[46] Occasional examples of the heavily embellished aulic styles of *stilus obscurus* and *stilus rhetoricus* occurred in major writers like Latini and Dante, but such examples were rare.[47] Almost everywhere after 1250,

[45] Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo," 38–40, and "Lovato: L'epistola a Bellino: Gli echi di Catullo," *IMU* 32 (1989): 110–16, for examples.

[46] See my "Medieval Italian Culture," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*, ed. A. Rabil, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1988), 1:48–49.

[47] The *stilus obscurus* tends to be confused with the *stilus rhetoricus*, which used different techniques for achieving its effects (see below, 300). The *stilus obscurus* was associated with the Hohenstaufen and papal courts in the middle decades of the thirteenth century. A highly artificial style, it sought to achieve eloquence through the use of allegory, an exotic vocabulary, numerous plays on words, alliterations, and assonances. Quotations were frequent but were primarily biblical. The distinguishing feature of the style was its allusiveness. It is that trait that distinguished the *stilus obscurus* from the *stilus supremus* or, as it was often called, the *stilus aureliensis*. The confusion occurs in Hans Schaller, "Die Kanzlei Kaiser Friedrichs II: Ihr Personal und ihr Sprachstil: Zweiter Teil," *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftengeschichte, Siegel– und Wappenkunde* 4 (1958): 275; Helene Wieruszowski, "A Twelfth-Century *Ars dictaminis* in the Barberini Collection of the Vatican Library," in her *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy*, Storia e letteratura, no. 121 (Rome, 1971): 335–36; and her

even at the papal *curia*, the traditional *stilus humilis* regained its twelfth-century status as the primary style of Italian chancery rhetoric. Because of its simplicity and accessibility, *stilus humilis* best met the practical needs of busy chancery officials, and the code-like character of the Latin permitted them to establish the appropriate tone in communicating their message.

The early thirteenth-century controversy over the number of parts in a letter, whether two, three, four, five, or six, lost its importance after 1250. On the whole, *dictatores* held to the traditional five-part pattern, while making allowances for fewer divisions, depending on the material involved. The value of using *cursus*, a subject of controversy in the early thirteenth century, was now simply assumed.[48] Mino da Colle (d. 1311),[49] Bichilino da Spella (fl. 1304), Giovanni del Virgilio (fl. 1321–26), and their contemporaries, Giovanni Batista Odonetti and Ventura da Bergamo, all rejected the two- and the three-meter *cursus* in favor of the four-meter one originally proposed by Guido Faba.[50]

"Rhetoric and the Classics In Italian Education," in ibid., 606. See my analysis of the *stilus aureliensis* in "On Bene of Florence's Conception of the French and Roman *Cursus*," *Rhetorica* 3 (1985): 77–98; and "Boncompagno on Rhetoric and Grammar," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986): 8–16.

[48] On this controversy, see my "Boncompagno on Rhetoric and Grammar," 13–16 and 22–23, where I discuss Boncompagno's hostility to the *cursus*.

[49] New material on Mino's life is published by Francesca L. Lagana, "Un maestro di scuola toscano del Duecento: Mino da Colle di Valdelsa," *Bollettino storico pisano* 58 (1989): 53–82; republished in *Città e servizi sociali nell'Italia dei secoli XII–XV: Dodicesimo convegno di studi del Centro italiano di studi di storia e d'arte, Pistoia, 9–12 ott. 1987* (Pistoia, 1990), 83–113. As was commonly the case, Mino was both a grammar teacher and a notary.

[50] On Faba's *cursus*, see A. Gaudenzi's edition of *Summa dictaminis* in *Propugnatore*, n.s., 3, no. 2 (1890): 347–48. For Mino da Colle, see BNF, Mag. VI, 152, f. 19. Odonetti's remarks on *cursus* are in BCS, 7–5–2, fols. 3v–4. The dating of Bichilino da Spello's *Pomerium rethorice* is given by Vincenzo Licitra in his *Il Pomerium rethorice di Bichilino da Spello* (Florence, 1947), xvi, and his doctrine on the *cursus*, 13–14. For Giovanni del Virgilio's definition of the *cursus*, see Paul O. Kristeller, "Un *Ars dictaminis* di Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 4 (1961): 194–97. The *cursus* in Ventura is found in D. Thomson and J.J. Murphy, "Dictamen as a Developed Genre: the Fourteenth Century *Brevia doctrina dictaminis* of Ventura da Bergamo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 33 (1982): 382–84. The dating of Bandini's *Laurea* is 1364/75: Teresa Hankey, "Bandini, Domenico," *DBI* 5 (Rome, 1963), 708. His doctrine on the *cursus* is found in BCS, 7–5–2, fols. 30v–31, and Bibl. Royale de Belgique, 1461–84, fols. 265v–66. *Regule rethorice* of Francesco Buti (1324–1406), BRF, 674, fols. 126–26v, describes the *cursus*. Opposed to this consensus is Laurence of Aquilea's doctrine, found in his *Theorica*, BCS, 7–5–2, fol. 42v. The edition of Laurence's *Practica* published by S. Capdevila, "La 'Practica dictaminis' de Llorens de Aquilea en un còdex de Tarragona," *Analecta sacra Tarraconensia* 6 (1930): 207–29, does not contain a sec-

Earlier Italian *dictatores* had sometimes stressed that attention should be paid to the harmonious placement of words in composing sentences, but the basic rules of the Italian *cursus* appear to have been formulated only in the last third of the twelfth century.[51] Papal adoption of the *cursus* in its correspondence after 1178/79 encouraged its adoption by chanceries throughout western Europe.[52] The practice quickly became common not only in letter writing but in all forms of prose writing. Initially designed to enhance the effectiveness of letters, which were conceived of as read orally, metric prose also came to be expected in compositions apparently read silently, suggesting that the act of reading retained strong ties with orality. By 1300, to the traditional three meters of the Roman *cursus*, *velox* (e.g., *sénsibus anfudérunt*), *tradus* (e.g., *hóstem admíttere*), and *planus* (e.g., *vísa puélla*), *dictatores* had added a second *planus* with the accent in both final words on the antepenultimate (e.g., *dóminum dícere*).[53]

The only major controversy among the later *dictatores* concerned punctuation. The treatises illustrate the ongoing conflict between the still vital ancient tradition of punctuation and the one becoming popular by the end of the thirteenth century.[54] *Dictatores* debated about the formation of different marks to be used for punctuation and which one was required after each of the four possible kinds of distinctions, namely, the *subdistinctio* (phrase), the *distinctio* (clause), the *clausula* (sentence), and the *oratio* (the whole text).

The compositional techniques of Bichilino da Spella, a teacher of *ars dictaminis* in the *studio* of Padua in the first years of the fourteenth century, exemplify the current teachings of the *ars*.[55] His *Pomerium*, published in 1304, discussed the traditional five-part letter (15) and a

---

tion on the *cursus*. Curiously, the most famous manual of the fourteenth century, the *Introductio brevis ad dictamen* of Giovanni di Bonandrea, published in 1303/04, offers confusing examples, which do not make clear his position on the *cursus*: see the unpublished dissertation of James Banker, "Giovanni di Bonandrea's *Ars Dictaminis* Treatise and the Doctrine of Invention in the Italian Rhetorical Tradition of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries" (Ph.D. Diss., Rochester, N.Y., 1972), 353–59.

[51] For references, see my "On Bene of Florence's Conception," 86.

[52] Indications of a major reform in the papal chancery in 1178/79 are discussed in ibid., 94–96. See in the same article a discussion of the rival French *cursus* with bibliography.

[53] See appendix.

[54] Francesco Novati, "Di un'*ars punctandi* erroneamente attribuita a Francesco Petrarca," *Rendiconti del r. Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*, 2nd ser., 42 (1909): 84–96.

[55] Vincenzo Licitra, *Il Pomerium rethorice*, discusses the erroneous identification of Quilichino da Spoleto and Bichilino da Spella, x–xii.

four-part *cursus*. In addition to *velox*, he had three *planus* meters (13–14). The first of the three, however, matched the traditional *tardus*, while the other two were identical with the first and second *planus* described above. Typical for manuals from the late thirteenth century on, the work also contained a detailed analysis of punctuation (11–13). There is no evidence of Bichilino's having contact with the Paduan humanists, but his presence in the *studio* indicates the continuing domination of prose composition by *ars dictaminis*.

No prose letters survive from Lovato or other members of the first generation of humanists. The absence does not mean that the first generation of humanists did not write such letters, but rather that they themselves or those who collected their literary output did not regard them as worthy of preservation because of their traditional character. Were it not for a prose letter sent by Mussato to a certain Benzo – almost certainly Benzo da Alessandria – that accompanied a copy of Mussato's *Centoloquia*, a similar dearth of prose letters would exist in the corpus of writings left by Padua's second generation of humanists.[56]

Although the epistolary preface to the poem that Mussato sent to Giovanni Soperano, Doge of Venice, better reflected Mussato's training in the traditional art of letter writing by observing the requisite

[56] The letter is found in *HA*, col. 768. Giuseppe Billanovich dates it between late 1328 and early 1329: *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell'Umanesimo*, 2 vols. in 3, Studi sul Petrarca, nos. 9 and 11 (Padua, 1981), 1.1:17 and 47–48. It was apparently designed to accompany a copy of Mussato's *Cento*, a reworking of Ovid's *Tristia* in a hundred lines (Mussato, *Opera*, fasc. 4, pp. 90–98). The opening lines of the letter read: "Contumeliarum mearum notiones cum verarum adiectione causarum his centenis dirigo metris, Benti carrissime, exuberantem naturam non arctiori modermine cohibere ipse valens, quae mihi, ut percussa excrescens hydra, querimoniarum ingruentias ingeminabat, dum in multiloquii vitium labi meorum consimilium more metuerem, quos sensuum inopia verborum facit esse copiosos, quin multus forem, evitare non potui. Accipe, et compatere, et habebis in eorum tenore, quod discas. Rotationes scilicet colludentis fortunae et elationes superbi sceleris iustitiam superantis."

On Benzo, see below, 167–68. The exiled Paduan was seeking the support of Pietro Marano, a powerful member of Cangrande's court, and was trying to use Benzo, Cangrande's chancellor, as an intermediary. He asked Benzo to pay Marano his respects: "Dominoque meo P. [Pietro di Marano, named a few lines above] de me per vices habe." On di Marano, see Giovanna Maria Gianola, "Tra Padova e Verona: il Cangrande di Mussato (e quello di Dante)," in *Gli Scaligeri, 1277–1387: Saggi e schede pubblicati in occasione della nostra storico-documentaria allestita dal Museo di Castelvecchio di Verona, giugno-novembre 1988*, ed. Gian Maria Varanini (Verona,1988), 57; and Natascia L. Carlotto, "Pietro 'Nan' da Marano: ritratto di un cortigiano scaligero," in ibid., 143–48.

formal divisions, the letter to Benzo also bears ample evidence of the author's allegiance to *ars dictaminis*.[57] As for Mussato's remaining prose works, two philosophical dialogues, *De lite* and *Contra fortuitos*, both written in a flat, unembellished Latin prose, show that Mussato concentrated his effort to classicize prose on historical writing.

A comparison between passages selected at random from Rolandino's *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie Trivixane*, completed about 1262, and from the *Historia augusta* illustrates Mussato's innovations in historical prose style.[58] Describing the motives for Padua's attack on the da Romano family and the people of Treviso in 1234, Rolandino wrote:

> Hic [Alberto di Mandello, podestà of Padua] rexit Paduam *annis duobus inmediate*. In quibus *duobus annis*, quamvis frater Johannes in predicto colloquio sive pace iussisset *treuwam* inter Tarvisinos et dompnos de Camino inter cetera sua dicta, tamen – licet ipsi Caminenses et olim fuissent et nunc de novo facti forent cives et amici Paduanorum – illi de Romano et Tarvisini eos *graviter* impugnabant, ipsorum terras *graviter* et cothidie *devastantes*, *cum* quidam ipsorum Caminensium inimici niterentur eis imponere *excessum* et homicidium potestatis Tarvisii. *Set* multi primo nuncii et ambaxatores sunt missi, ne talis iniuria fieret Paduanorum amicis. *Set* cum preces omnes funderentur in vanum, *videns* populus paduanus vires aliquando plus *valere* quam iura, *videns* eciam *quod* interdum ex humilitate pravitas sumit robur, immo ferro quandoque rescin-

[57] The letter preface was published by Giovanni Monticolo, "Poesie latine del principio del secolo XIV nel codice 277 ex Brera al reale Archivio di stato di Venezia," *Il Propugnatore*, n.s., 3 (1890): 293: "[*salutatio*] "Summo pelagi domino regnique Veneciarum principi, Iohani Superancio, Albertinus Muxatus paduanus, istoriarum scriptor et artis poetice professor, [*exordium*] pedes amplectens fausto omine bene fausti muneris de profundo maris summi Dei provisione prodeuntis et gratulatus domino meo duci, [*narratio*] collatione habita cum sequacibus meis musis, quod ab eis habui ad versiculos redegi non quales huiusce rei nobilitas appeciit, sed et rei publice mee perplexitas permisit, et imbecillitas concepit ingenii, supplente fidei mee sinceritate defectum .... [*petitio*] Accipite igitur, queso, clementer, clare dux, hoc poema cum minimi reconmendatione mancipii." Phrases such as "pedes amplectens," "fausto omine," "collatione habita," were dear to medieval *dictatores*. The style of the letter to Benzo, while reflecting Mussato's classicizing prose in its complicated syntax, is essentially *stilus supremus* or *stilus aureliensis*. It contains phrases common to *ars dictaminis*: "cum verarum adiectione causarum," "arctiore modermine cohibere," "in eorum tenore." It also displays an exaggerated use of etymology and alliteration with "superbi sceleris ... superantis." The unclassical "ingruentia," however, reflects Mussato's penchant for creating nouns from present active participles. He does this frequently in his historical writings as well.

[58] The Rolandino text is found in *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie Trivixane* ed. A. Bonardi, *RIS*, new ser., 8.1 (Città di Castello, 1905–08), 46. That from Mussato is found in *HA*, bk. IV, rub. 3, cols. 389–90.

> ditur cum dolore, quod in tumorem permisit crescere pietas medicorum, plurimis vicibus, licet invitus, idem populus terras invasit hostiliter illorum de Romano, discurrens per terras, per castra et per confinia Pedemontis etc.[59]

In describing Henry VII's attack on Brescia, Mussato wrote as follows:

> Nec remissus ad incumbentia Caesaris animus aggrediendi montani castri, quod moeniis civitatis contiguum est, fortunam tentare in sequentem diem constituit. Iam primum illuscesceret. *Ordinatis* itaque in ipso crepusculo *centuriis peditum*, militumque suis singulis ordinibus totam veluti *insulturus* civitatem, ne intrinseci in castri succursum convolarent, fundibularios, levisque armaturae pedites, *quorum* fere quingentos et mille Januenses direxerant, ceterosque ad expugnationem cum balistarum, tormentorumque omnis generis apparatibus ingeniosos ad castri oppugnationem sero praeordinat, *summoque mane* lituum ac tubarum clamoribus universi exercitus copias moenia *circumeduxit*. *Perterriti* tanto fremitu Brixiani per propugnacula quaeque assilientes, muros corona *cinxere*. Ad castri munitionem solitas bellicosorum excubias *misere*, seque ad sua quisque loca *coaptavit*. Assurgentes itaque Galli, Germani, Tuscorum Longobardorumque distincti ordines cum tegmentis, caeterisque instrumentis *accessere* ad castri foveas citeriores, *excisasque rupes circumquaque*.[60]

---

[59] The translation reads as follows: "He ruled Padua continuously for two years. In which time, despite the fact that in the preceding conference or meeting brother John had ordered, among other things, a truce between the Trevisans and the lords of Camini, members of the da Romano family and the Trevisans were savagely attacking the da Camino, who had formerly been and now again had been made citizens and friends of the Paduans. Daily they devastated da Camino lands, since certain men, enemies of the da Camino, strove to convict them of the death and murder of the *podestà* of Treviso. But first of all, many messengers and ambassadors were sent to prevent injury from being inflicted on friends of the Paduans. But since all prayers ended in nothing, the Paduan people saw that sometimes force is more effective than rights, and moreover, that sometimes depravity draws power from humility, nay rather that what doctors out of sympathy allow to grow into a tumor is sometimes cut out with pain by the knife. Accordingly, the Paduan people, although reluctant, aggressively invaded the lands of the da Romano family, overrunning the lands, the fortresses, and the borders of the Piedmont."

[60] The translation reads as follows: "Relentlessly making plans for attacking the mountain castle, which is near the walls of the city, the mind of Caesar decided to test fortune on the following day as soon as it was light. Thus, at dusk he drew up the ranks of infantry and the several ranks of his knights as if he were about to attack the city, in order that those inside not hasten to bring aid to the castle. In the darkness, however, he organized for an assault on the castle the stonethrowers and lightly armed infantry, of which the Genoese had sent fifteen hundred, and other men skilled in attacking with all kinds of slings and stonethrowers. At daybreak, with the clamor of trumpets and horns, he led the forces of the whole army around the walls. Thoroughly frightened at such noise, the people of Brescia, springing up on whatever

Perhaps the most salient difference between the two passages lies in the contrast between Mussato's tight and highly structured narration of the preparation for the assault on the fortress and Rolandino's loosely organized account of the political situation in the Veneto. Rolandino's indifference to the repetition of *annis duobus* in the first two sentences and his preference for a series of present active participles – *videns* (twice), *devastantes*, and *discurrens* – creates an informal, discursive tone. As with *duobus annis* and *videns*, the repetition of *graviter* in the same period and the use of *set* to begin two successive periods reinforce the impression of unimaginative narration.

Initially, Rolandino used classicizing style for *oratio obliqua* in that the infinitive followed the first *videns* (*videns ... valere*), but then he employed a *quod* in medieval fashion after the second. He seemed unable to state the medical analogy clearly: that surgery despite its attendant pain was sometimes necessary to prevent the growth of a tumor (*immo ferro ... pietas medicorum*). The connections between his ideas were not always precise: he did not prepare the reader for the first *set*: "But first ...." nor was the invasion of the lands of the da Camino clearly linked to the explanation in the result clause (*cum*), that the enemy wanted to blame the family for the murder of Treviso's *podestà*.[61]

By contrast, Mussato's account of Henry VII's attack on the fortress of Brescia offered a tightly woven, logically developed description of the succession of events. In a complicated period that moved from an ablative absolute (*ordinatis ... centuriis*) to a future participle (*insultaturus*), then to a purpose clause (*ne ...*), and finally to a relative clause (*quorum*), Mussato provided an ordered account of the preparations from twilight until dawn. He concluded the period, however, with a declarative clause announcing the beginning of the assault at daybreak (*summoque mane ... circumeduxit*). This sequence had been prepared in the first line of the passage by a psychological portrayal of the emperor restlessly searching for a plan of attack, ending in his resolution to take the field on the following day (*Nec remissus ... constituit*).

---

ramparts they could, fortified the walls in crowds. They sent the usual guard of warriors to protect the fortress and each one took his assigned place. Thus, rising up with covering roofs and other devices, the French, Germans, and different ranks of Tuscans and Lombards approached the nearer ditches of the fortress and the hewn rocks protecting it on all sides."

[61] Also note the unclassical *immediate*, *treuwam*, and *excessum* (in this sense).

The use of the historical present in the following two periods, i.e., *cinxere*, *misere*, and *accessere*, gave immediacy to the action, whereas the perfect *coaptavit* conveyed the defenders' response, which had become second nature for them since the start of the siege. The author adroitly conveyed the terror roused in the inhabitants, causing them to rush to the ramparts (*perterriti ... cinxere*), and the difficulty of scaling the walls of the fortress defended by ditches and "hewn rocks protecting it on all sides" (*excisasque rupes circumquaque*).[62]

Contemporaries of Mussato who read more than a brief passage like the text cited above would have been struck not only by the comparative difficulty of the syntax, but also by the author's failure to comply with the standard rules of the Italian *cursus*. While 78 per cent of Rolandino's sentence endings conformed to the *cursus*, only 58 per cent do in Mussato's case.[63] Because patterns of the *cursus* occur naturally in Latin prose about 45–50 per cent of the time, such a low percentage of endings in *cursus* in Mussato's prose suggests he was consciously rejecting the traditional medieval prose metric.[64] Perhaps in conjunction with the greater complexity of Mussato's Latin, the relative absence of *cursus* may also signal a weakening of the ties between reading and orality.

Both stylistically and conceptually, Mussato's *Historia augusta* was indebted to the ancient historians Livy, Sallust, Caesar, and Suetonius. As Mussato humbly expressed it, Livy was the *archigraphus patavinus* and – in a military analogy – a knight, while he, Mussato, was only a foot soldier.[65] Mussato's use of prodigies and his heavy

[62] His preference for the gerundive (*aggrediendi montani castri*), rather than for the gerund (*aggrediendi montanum castrum*) that medieval writers preferred, gives another indication of his interest in stylistic reform: J.B. Hofmann and Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 373–75.

[63] See appendix.

[64] Gudrun Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus: Seine Entwicklung und sein Abklingen in der Briefliteratur Italiens*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, no. 10 (Stockholm and Uppsala, 1963), 151, n. 305, gives 50 per cent as the accidental frequency of prescribed meters in Latin. I hold that a percentage above 50 per cent suggests some continuing preference for *cursus*. In Mussato's case, my sense is that, while renouncing the *cursus*, he was still somewhat attracted to the recommended meters.

[65] The preface dedicating the work to Henry, omitted from the seventeenth-century edition, was published by Muratori, *RIS* 10, col. 10. Mussato acknowledges his inferiority to Livy: "nam licet ea rudis a Patavini suavitate distet archigraphi." Mussato employs the military analogy in *Epistolae*, 2, lines 25–28, in *Opera*, fasc. 4, p. 42. Generally my account of Mussato's ancient sources draws on Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:107–08.

reliance on speeches demonstrate Livy's influence, although Boncompagno and Rolandino may also have served him as modern precedents for the speeches.[66] Mussato's habit of referring to himself in the third person probably reflected the influence of Julius Caesar's *Commentaria*, as did the opening lines of the *Historia augusta*, which emphasized the geographical setting of the narrative:

> Lucembore oppidum est Francorum fines a Germanis
> Distinguens, a telluris sterilitate nomen accipiens.[67]

Similarly, Mussato drew on Sallust for his inclusion of documents in the text and on Suetonius for his characterization of individuals. He borrowed elements of the latter's description of Roman emperors in order to craft his evocative portrayal of Henry's personality. Although certain aspects of his depiction of the emperor's physical traits could have been influenced by the teachings of medieval *ars poetria* on *ekphrasis* (description), uncharacteristic of the *ars* approach were the concise references to the king's spot of baldness "as much as a thumb could cover" and his "cautious, succinct way of speaking," which deftly encapsulated the monarch's image and personality.[68]

The word *archigraphus* appears only in Mussato. C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 10 vols. (Niort, 1883–87), s.v. *archigraphus*, suggests that the word was closely related to the more common *antigraphus* and meant notary or chancellor. That meaning would seem inappropriate here. Mussato seems to use it to praise Livy as a great writer.

[66] His prose is also marked by Livy's use of the future participle as a true participle rather than in conjunction with a form of *esse*: see *insultaturus* in the passage analyzed in the text above. Cf. "Annibaldus vero, Johannes de Sabello, et Thebaldus de Campofloris Regi Romanorum parituros se se obtulere in omnem casum, et adversus omnes cognationis suae, singulis dumtaxat exceptis" (*HA*, VIII.4, col. 454); or "... Deumque in se propitium de corde non abjiciens, sed eventuros successus mente usquequaque conjectans" (ibid., VIII.6, col. 459). The phrase *remittere animum* is very frequent in Livy (e.g., V.25.11; V.41.4; and IX.12.7) but in other ancient authors as well (Cicero, *Leg.*, II.15.38, and Pliny, *Epist.*, VII.9.13).

[67] *HA*, I.1, cols. 27–28: "Luxembourg is a town separating the borders of the French from the Germans, taking its name from the sterility of the soil."

[68] Guido Billanovich, "Abozzi e postille del Mussato nel Vaticano *Lat.* 1769," *IMU* 28 (1985): 18–19, provides specific indications of Mussato's dependence on Suetonius for the portrait of Henry. The italicized words in Mussato's description of Henry VII (I.13, cols. 339–40) represent borrowings from Suetonius: "Homo *gracilis*, *statura prope iusta*, *colore capillo*que *subruffis*, *eminentibus superciliis*, sinistri oculi albuginem detegit plus aequo mobilitas. De planicie in acutum apicem nasus se porrigit. Ore *venusto*, mento terete, coma gallica, quantum pollex operiret, conspicit *occiput*. *Cervix humeros* a capite *congrua aequalitate* discriminat. Nulla tergorum *obesitas*. Ventris et *pectoris* veluti linealis *aequalitas*, pedumque et crurium *commensurata* conformitas. Loquela tarda succinctaque, idioma gallicum, satisque se conferens intelligentiae Latinorum.

The most important lesson Mussato learned about writing history, however, he owed to the ancient pagan historians collectively. They taught him how to reveal the structure of an historical event, that is, to texture its development chronologically and illuminate the interplay of its causes. Through his reading, Mussato discovered the more exacting ways of expressing sequential relationships afforded by the richer syntax of ancient Latin. Especially to the extent that he appreciated the ancients' discriminating use of moods and tenses; participles, gerunds, and gerundives; and finite and infinitive verbal forms, he found himself better able to capture the complex flow of historical time. The weaker syntactical arsenal available to previous Italian historians helps explain the loose, meandering character of Rolandino's historical account.[69]

Sincere in feeling himself artistically inferior to his ancient teachers, Mussato nevertheless tried to approximate the ancient periodic sentence. He was not always successful. At times, his periods remained unconcluded or their various clauses unintegrated. At others, perhaps unwittingly, he introduced neologisms and twisted the Latin to conform to a vernacular sentence structure.[70] Nevertheless, the

---

Magnanimitatem concomitari mansuetudo videbatur et divini cultus instans sedulitas." Mussato borrowed the unusual word *occiput* from Persius I.62, who has *occiput* where Suetonius, *Tib.* 68, uses *occipitium*.

In describing a human being, authors of the French *artes poetrie* were satisfied with an exhaustive description of his or her physical characteristics. Geoffrey of Vinsauf, for instance, in his *Poetria nova*, ed. Edmond Farel, in *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et XIIIe siècles: Recherches et documents sur les techniques littéraires du moyen âge* (Paris, 1923), 214–15, begins his description of a woman as follows: "Crinibus irrutilet color auri; libia coaequet/ Forma supercilii; geminos intersecet arcus/ Lactea forma viae; castiget regula nasi/ Ductum, ne citra sistat vel transeat aequum ...."

[69] Although Michael Baxandall's *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350–1450* (Oxford, 1971) attributes greater sophistication and exactness in expression to the recovery of Ciceronian periodic style, which he sees beginning with Petrarch (see below, 418), he would probably grant that Mussato's historical prose gained much from his effort to imitate the style of ancient historians. The point of my analysis here is that attention to style not only allowed Mussato to describe the temporal process better but in so doing increased his understanding of time as a dimension of human experience.

[70] Because the work has never been systematically edited, it is difficult to know when the weakness of the syntax is Mussato's and when the product of the amanuenses and early editors. See, for example, IX.4, col. 477: "Tuncque in civitate per multos annos florente, cujus decus et honorificentia assurgentibus insolentiis ceteras veluti famulantes peculiaribus premebat obsequiis, quamque, ut Italiae apicem, populi Gallici, Germani, Ligures, Illyrici, Apuli, Siculi, Aragones, Hispani et omne Latinorum nomen venerabatur, obsessa sic repente, veluti sui ipsius pondere gravis, quatiebatur ...." Syntactically, the ablative absolute *in civitate ... florente* makes

overall effect of the prose was classicizing. Mussato's practice of translating technical terms of contemporary government into their ancient Roman equivalents wherever possible helped maintain a classical tone.

Mussato's stylistic concerns melded successfully with his grasp of detail to present a brilliant account of Henry VII's Italian expedition during the years 1310–13.[71] Seizing on the expedition as his central principle of organization, Mussato chronicled the three years of political history, in which he himself played a minor role as the leading representative of the commune to the emperor. In an era of deepseated prejudices, he seemed singularly dispassionate in his judgment of personalities. Like Dante, he was raised in a Guelf tradition, yet he realized the futility of party struggles and was drawn to an emperor who promised to favor neither Guelf nor Ghibelline. At the same time, Mussato admitted the mistakes of the well-intentioned prince, who, ignorant of Italian politics, was finally carried away by events and became a prisoner of the Ghibelline tyrants in his politics. The work communicates a sense of disappointment at lost opportunities and weariness with internecine struggles – struggles that did not end with the emperor's death.

In constructing his narrative, Mussato masterfully kept Henry at center stage amidst the complex swirl of events in Paris, Naples, Avignon, Rome, and the cities of the North. Even when entire chapters focused on local action in Padua or Florence, Mussato reminded the reader that those accounts were only episodes of a greater narrative. Despite occasional awkward phrasings and periods that did not quite conclude, Mussato had a gift for subtly linking cause to effect and concisely recounting a series of actions. At times he managed to rise above the flow of events to contemplate the process of history as it unfolded. His Sallustian aphorisms reflected such meditations, as when he wrote:

---

no sense. Or again an awkward passage like IV.1, col. 387: "Et si jamjam mitescente autumnale tempus sole, imbribusque decidentibus, quod nunc intolerabile, tunc impossible ipsis contingat populis stationibus insidere." Note medieval Latin words like *conductus*, i.e., employ (I.10, col. 331); and *cassus*, from *cassare*, i.e., to destroy (IV.1, col. 416). Examples of derivatives of Italian words are *subarras* from *le sbarre* (VIII.4, col. 455); *campanis ... ad certamen pulsatis* from *suonare all'arme* (VIII.4, col. 456); and *saltus auferrent* from *levare li passi*, i.e., impede (IX.2, col. 472).

[71] The history of the expedition is recounted in detail by William Bowsky, *Henry VII in Italy: The Conflict of Empire and City-State, 1310–1313* (Lincoln, Neb., 1960).

> For, just as generally happens in all political communities, seditions arise from the less powerful to the more powerful, and thus human instinct is always vexed and induces inferiors to seek revolution.[72]

It is a comment worthy of Machiavelli.[73]

4

After Henry's death, Mussato embarked on another history, *De gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII Cesarem*, which chronicled Italian politics from August 1313 to at least July 1321.[74] Late in life, he composed two short historical works in prose. The first, *Ludovicus Bavarus, ad filium*, dealing with Ludwig of Bavaria, Mussato dedicated to his own son. The second, *De traditione Patavii ad Canem Grandem anno 1328 mense septembris et causis precedentibus*, a passionate indictment of Padua's betrayal into the hands of Cangrande, ended with the first months of 1329, the year of Mussato's death in exile in Chioggia.[75]

Written in the throes of the deepest pessimism, the latter work connected the fall of the Paduan commune to a historical theory elaborated in the *De lite inter naturam et fortunam*, a treatise composed after 1325, early in the author's final exile.[76] According to Mussato,

---

[72] *HA*, VIII, 8, col. 466: "Nam sicut in omnibus politiis plurimum contingens est, ex minus potentibus ad potentiores exoriuntur seditiones sicque semper humanus vexatur instinctus isque ad novarum rerum optiones inferiores inducit." Paolo Marangon, "Marsilio tra preumanesimo e cultura delle arti," in *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare: Gli studi nell'Università e nei conventi di Padova nei secoli XIII e XIV*, ed. T. Pesenti (Trieste, 1997), 385, n. 28, suggests that Aristotle's *Politics*, V.2, 1302a 29–31, cited in Geremia da Montagnone's *Compendium*, was Mussato's source for this observation.

[73] His general views on historical causation are discussed below.

[74] See above, 131, n. 41.

[75] In the Venice edition of 1636, the second is printed as bk. XII of *De gestis Italicorum*, 79–112, and the first immediately after but separately paginated, 1–10. In Muratori the second is found on pp. 715–68 and the first on 769–84.

[76] Written in the last years of his life, Mussato's *De lite inter naturam et fortunam* and *Contra casus fortuitos* are found in two manuscripts, Museo Civico Padua, 2531, fols. 1–46v and 47–60, respectively, and BCS, 5.1.5, fols. 1–56. A. Moschetti, "Il *De lite inter naturam et fortunam* e il *Contra casus fortuitos* di Albertino Mussato," in *Miscellanea di studi critici in onore di V. Crescini* (Cividale, 1927), 591–99, edited a small portion of the works. Cf. Nicolai Rubinstein, "Municipal Progress and Decline in the Italy of the Communes," in *Fritz Saxl, 1890–1948: A Volume of Memorial Essays from His Friends in England*, ed. D.J. Gordon (London,1957), 169, n. 5. For an edition of *De lite*, see Guido Billanovich and G. Travaglia, "Per l'edizione del 'De lite inter naturam et fortunam' e del 'Contra casus fortuitos' di Albertino Mussato," *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova* 31–43 (1942–54): 279–97. The introductory lines of the preface to the

Lovato and Rolando Piazzola had already spoken of the commune as if it were in its senescence, but Mussato said nothing as to whether they had developed the implication that the commune had a life-cycle developed into a theory.[77] Similarly, Mussato's earlier historical writings, including the *De gestis Italicorum*, in which he mused pessimistically on the commune's loss of vitality, failed to reflect a general explanation for historical change.[78] Despite its various references to fortune, fate, and universal divine providence, the *Ecerinis* made no effort to sort them out as causal forces.

After his exile in 1325, Mussato had both leisure and motivation to develop his thought. In his letter dedicating the *De lite* to Pagano della Torre, Patriarch of Aquileia, he explained that the exposition of the causal forces affecting human action that he was about to present stemmed from his need to understand his own successes and failures.[79] If at one level the dialogue between Nature and Fortune was an abstract analysis of causation, at another, it was directly related to his own experiences.[80]

In the treatise itself, speaking in the voice of Nature, Mussato maintained that the healthy life of a republic (*politia*) was limited to about forty years, after which time, becoming corrupted by wealth, the republic descended into oligarchy and then either into democracy or tyranny.[81] Although assigning fifty rather than forty years as the growth period for a commune, the *De traditione* envisaged a similar

---

De lite were published by Moschetti, "Il *De lite*," 570. Moschetti, ibid., 586, dates the treatise as 1327, but without solid evidence.

[77] See above, 110, n. 77.

[78] The causative influences found in the historical works are also referred to in the *Ecerinis*: action of the stars (line 1: 23); geographical location and soil (lines 176–78; 34); fortune (see above, 110, n. 77); and divine order. The references throughout to divine order, especially in the speeches of fra Luca (Act III), are clearly Christian.

[79] *De lite*, fol. 1v: "Ad insulam Methamocensem propter concussam imo ruentem nostram rem publicam a qua etsi fuga me movisset, sponte migrandum erat, fortuna, non dicam aversante, sed favente me contuli, ubi libero fretus celo, animi quiete, corpore tuto, rerum plusquam natura desideret commoditate resedi. Cepique mecum de vite mee preterite assiduis agitationibus deque indeficientibus nunc nature nunc fortune certatione conflictibus intrinseca mea ratiocinatione conferre."

[80] The following paragraphs on Mussato's political theory are largely a summary of Rubinstein's excellent article, "Municipal Progress and Decline," 170.

[81] The use of Aristotelian political terminology to describe constitutional change is already found in *DGI* (Rubinstein, "Municipal Progress," 174–75). Rubinstein, 172–73, rightly singles out the influence of Sallust's stress on Roman materialism as a cause of the state's decline. He points out that whereas Sallust attacked the imperialism of the Romans (*imperii cupido*), Mussato attacks the *pecuniae cupido* of his people.

pattern of development.[82] As in the *De lite*, greed and luxury were responsible for the breakdown of the social and political order.

Nature explained to fortune how and why the process of growth and decay occurred.

> I construct and beget cities through associations of humankind so that they unite in a concern for common interests, with fair laws, good morals, and mutual benefits. And as if they had the substance of one human being, I encourage and favor them with my benefits; I inform them with spiritual virtues for preserving and shaping themselves in unity .... [83]

When, however, cities wallowed in luxury, attacked their neighbors, and scorned God,

> they will not perish at once by one blow. What I make by building up over a long time I destroy with a long slackening (*resolutionibus*).[84]

Mussato drew the lexicon and phrasing for his ideas on growth and decay from Roman historians, but he tended to identify Padua's fate with that of its Trojan progenitor. When Fortune boasted that the destruction of Troy had resulted from the chance event of Helen's rape, Nature scornfully replied that human passions had brought about the change of events, which in turn had driven this *columen Asie* (crown of Asia) to its ruin.[85] By Nature's favor alone, the city had grown, and "for my just reasons, it fell in my unwindings" (*resolutionibus*). After explaining the downfall of Troy, Nature then referred to Padua, "this other Troy," as founded by exiled Antenor.[86]

The powers Mussato assigns to nature indicate his belief in the connection between historical cycles and astrological theory. A passage from the later *De traditione* (1328) underscores this association:

> Paduan posterity might observe the fortune of their city, as it were, imposed by nature herself and the fatal sentence of its own history,

[82] *De traditione* (in *DGI*, XII.1, col. 715).

[83] *De lite*, fols. 20v: "Struo et gigno per hominum consortia civitates ut cura rerum communium equis legibus moribusque bonis ac mutuis comodis coalescant et quod ad modum hominis unius substantiam meis benefitiis errigo; foveo spiritualibus virtutibus ad sese contuendos et conformandos ...."

[84] Ibid., fol. 21. These enemies of Nature "non uno tamen statim ictu concussionis intererunt. Quae enim longa compositione conficio, diuturna resolutione consterno."

[85] Ibid., fol. 21: "Si non opes, luxus, pompe, contumelie gentes finitimas ad sui invidias lacessissent, starent pergama in secula hodierna."

[86] Ibid., fol. 21v. Fortune makes this identification: "Heccine altera illa Troia est que Anthenore profugo condita secus mare Venetum Timavo ambita fluvio cis montes tam longa pace sedet Euganeos."

> whether on account of the location of the land or by a fluctuation of some kind of elements or by some sort of disposition concealed from mortals.[87]

At least insofar as they relate to "fluctuations" and "dispositions," these and similar suggestions of impersonal causes may in part have been inspired directly by the natural philosopher Pietro d'Abano, whose astrological teachings at Padua had been investigated by the inquisition in the previous decade.[88] The theory would have proven useful to Mussato as a way of explaining most recent Paduan history: after the expulsion of Ezzelino in 1257, the commune of Padua had enjoyed a long period of expansion followed by a gradual but pronounced decay, as if following a predetermined cycle independent of human control.

Mussato, however, postponed a complete exposition of his theory of universal causation until the conclusion of *De lite*, where Christ declared that nature, like all other causal forces, functioned in subordination to Divine Will.

> We have willed that, so far as the human body is concerned, man is set under our celestial bodies; as far as the intellect, under the angels, that is, under our separated substances, but it pleased us to retain the will under our power, wherefore some things happen to man without his intention or rather with it excluded. Yet things are not able to happen for any reason outside the order of heavenly bodies or the disposition of our angels or of ourselves. For, although we alone work directly on human intention, the action of angels has some effect on human choice by force of persuasion. The action of a heavenly body works through disposing, in so far as the corporeal impressions of celestial bodies dispose some choices of action on human bodies themselves.[89]

---

[87] *De traditione* (in *DGI*, XII.1, col. 715): "...Paduana posteritas fortunam urbis suae, et velut ab ipsa natura inditum, ac fatale eventuum suorum judicium speculetur, sive pro terrae situ sive talium elementorum fluxu seu quavis occulta dispositione mortalibus." Cf. Rubinstein, "Municipal Progress and Decline," 177–79.

[88] Ibid., 179. For examples of Mussato's detailed descriptions of celestial events, see *DGI*, VII.14, cols. 672–73; and *HA*, XV.4, col. 554.

[89] *De lite*, fols. 43–43v (interpolation mine): "Genus humanum secundum corpus ordinatum esse sub nostris corporibus celestibus voluimus. Secundum intellectum vero sub angelis, id est, sub nostris substantiis separatis; sed vero voluntatem placuit retinuisse sub nobis, quamobrem possunt aliqua homini, non admissa imo potius oclusa sua intentione contingere. Non tamen ea praeter ordinem celestium corporum vel nostrorum angelorum dispone [dispositionem?] vel nostrum ulla ratione contingere. Quamvis enim nos soli directe ad intentionem hominis operemur, tamen actio angeli ad electionem hominis per motum suasionis aliquid operatur. Actio vero celestis corporis per modum dispondendi inquantum corporales celestium corporum impressiones actionum aliquas electiones in corpora ipsa humana disponunt."

No other subordinate causes existed aside from the action generated by celestial bodies and angels: "Fortune" and "Fate" were mere human creations that reflected man's ignorance of divine purposes.[90]

Mussato never developed a political theory to match his vision of the universal order. Using Aristotelian constitutional terminology, he depicted his city as a *politia* in the first forty years after its liberation in 1259. Then, after twenty years in which government alternated between oligarchy and democracy, the fiercely divided city, facing the threat of hostile forces from abroad, surrendered to a tyrant.[91]

Even though he considered the *politia* to be the healthy constitution for Padua, Mussato never defined what he meant by a republican constitution, nor did he develop a theory to defend it against the claims of monarchy. He ignored the distinctions between the political regimes of republican and imperial Rome and, as his support for Henry VII indicates, he accepted Padua's traditional status as a part of the political hierarchy of which the emperor constituted the head. Although he never articulated a conceptual framework to explain his political commitment, he did demonstrate a preference for popular government. In the *De lite*, Nature branded Paduan civic life in the periods of democratic rule as "intolerable," but she conceded that, at least, the city did not become more corrupt under democracy, nor did democracy lead directly to tyranny (as Aristotle would have predicted).[92]

---

[90] He provides an extensive discussion on fortune, ibid., fol. 43-45. On fate, he writes, ibid., fols. 46–46v: "Ex quibus verba et opiniones omnium dicentium aliquid fatum esse vel fuisse cassamus, irritamus et prophana enuntiantes evacuamus omnimoda veritate."

[91] Ibid., fol. 22: "Communitas hec, hiis corupta crassantiis, ad oligariciam transit, ping(u)i populo insignes sequente, plebe oppressa. Et si quando, ut non nunquam obtingit, invida simultatibusque maiorum, plebs efferatur ad democratiam, adeo superbe dominatur ut pene intollerabillis sit. Verum ea respublica per preteritorum eventuum consequentias *nunquam* plebe dominante corupta est aut nacta tiranidem sed semper ultimatur factione maiorum. Ubi in huius etatis serie circiter vigesimum annum lapsivitum est, ad letalem morbus pariter ventum est nec ultra sese patitur quin primo alicuius externi belli tumultu seu cum finitimis seu precipue adventantibus alamanorum seu gallorum regibus in se ipsam divisa hodiis intestinis certatim dominum sibi adsistat." Rubinstein, "Municipal Progress and Decline," 170, who quotes this passage with many ellipses, omits the crucial *nunquam* in the third sentence.

[92] See specifically the following sentence from the passage quoted in my previous note: "Verum ea respublica per preteritorum eventuum consequentias nunquam plebe dominante corupta est aut nacta tiranidem sed semper ultimatur factione maiorum."

Whereas in the *Ecerinis* he represented the citizenry as a chorus narrating and commenting on actions of the protagonists, his epic poem *De obsidione* showed his confidence in republican government. As the *De obsidione* opened, the Paduan people, who valiantly resisted and finally overcame the invader, were celebrated as the hero:

> O Clio, honored sister, celebrate in whatever song you will this man, the unconquered man (*vir* = people) feared throughout all Italy, and do not disdain a harp pursuing you with an uneven sound. The times of the sacred poets have passed away. Now our own age, with its lesser means, affords a weak song with sweet harmony.[93]

Almost immediately the poet demanded of God, "Who unrolls our eternal centuries by his law," why He persisted in afflicting the remains of the Trojan people after having destroyed their original home.

As in the *Ecerinis*, God's overriding control of the universe went unquestioned. Despite making repeated references to astral influences, fortune, fate, and chance, Mussato portrayed them as functioning under divine control.

> But no rights of war are powerful enough, no mind or any work of human virtue. Chance rules all things. The Lady Fates break their threads as they will. The stars dispose both the minds of men and their paths with God looking on, Who by His Will corrects each thing and decides in all the affairs of men.[94]

If impersonal forces only appeared to dominate human lives and God's Will was the ultimate cause of all that occurred, little room seemed left for human will. Nonetheless, Mussato explained Cangrande's aggression as God's punishment for Padua's pride.[95] He contrasted the simplicity, unity, and peace of Padua in its early days with its present corruption by wealth. As in his prose histories, the Sallustian attack on corruption of the body politic by riches explained

[93] *DGI*, col. 687a: "Invictum populum, formidatumque per omnem/ Italiam Clio quovis Soror inclyta cantu/ ede virum, nec te non aequa voce sequentem/ dedignare Chelyn. Sacrorum tempora Vatum/ praeteriere, modis nunc nostra minoribus Aetas/ admittit tenerum leni modulamine carmen."

[94] Ibid., col. 703a: "Sed nil jura valent belli, mens ulla, vel unum/ Humanae virtutis opus. Regit omnia Casus./ Pro libitu Dominae rumpunt sua stamina Parcae/ Sidera disponunt hominum mentesque modosque,/ Inspectante Deo, proprio qui singula nutu/ Corrigit, et cunctos hominum praeponderat actus."

[95] Ibid., col. 691a: "Non aliter vestros potuit sedare furores./ Vestra quidem dignis mulctavit crimina poenis."

the breakdown of civic life and the rise of factions among the nobility.

> While the old men live, the republic lives, and when they disappear, hostile pride, arising, surges forth.[96]

Crimes committed out of self-interest by Padua's supposed leaders could not fail to harm its innocent people, just as the crime of Paris had doomed Padua's ancestors:

> Nothing remains of Asia after the destruction of Troy. Today that people is thought by all to be a vile herd.[97]

The Paduans' pride, which led them to despise their neighbors, and their inconstancy, which caused them to reject the friendship of Henry VII, led Henry to grant Vicenza to Cangrande, thereby significantly increasing Cangrande's power.

Mussato dramatically depicted the breakdown of civil society that had occurred in the city. The powerful had turned mobs against the citizens, and the markets had become the haunts of murderers.

> Public rights succumbed to private ones; nor from that point on was any room left in the city to obey the established statutes. Henceforth the republic, subjected to a few men, perished.[98]

Many citizens had sought safety in exile; those who remained had needed an armed escort to walk the streets. Seeking to restore peace at home and abroad, the Paduans had created a lord for themselves.

> But alas, civil war has not quieted but rather increased, as well as external war.[99]

In its weakened condition, Padua faced the onslaught of Cangrande, who was urged on by Paduan exiles seeking revenge on their enemies.

In the body of the poem, when dealing with the military engagements between Cangrande and the besieged, Mussato exalted the role of the people, the free crowd (*libera turba*), who, while the nobility

---

[96] Ibid., col. 689a: "Dumque senes vivunt, vivit respublica: cumque/ deficiunt, oriens inimica superbia surgit."

[97] Ibid., col. 690ab: "Res mansere Asiae post diruta Pergama nullae/ Vile pecus cunctis hodie Gens illa putata est."

[98] Ibid., col. 691b: "Publica privatis cesserunt jura; nec inde/ Ullus in urbe locus solitis parere statutis./ Dehinc subjecta viris periit respublica paucis ...."

[99] Ibid., col. 691c: "Heu neque sopitum bellum civile; sed auctum/ eternumque simul."

had remained divided, had suffered hunger and the dangers of battle to defend the republic. In lines echoing the *Disticha Catonis*, Mussato praised sacrifice for the *patria*:

> O public devotion in the face of threatening and powerful death, dying for which one unquestionably lives eternally![100]

The citizens worked together for this purpose in absolute unity,

> as if the souls of all were in one body and one mind at the same time, to defend the city with their strength. For where the bells were struck to indicate a battle, there that people rushed headlong.[101]

They lined the walls so thickly that when Cangrande attacked, "no place is left free of wounding arrows." They even lowered themselves down by ropes from the walls into the protection of the moat and from there attacked the hated enemy in hand-to-hand combat.[102] One night, stealthily emerging from the city, the Paduans, "that innumerable people of ants," dug away the earthen wall with which the enemy surrounded part of the city and greatly reduced it in size, carrying the dirt away in whatever way they could.[103] Although in the emergency Jacopo da Carrara had been elected lord of the city, it was the Paduan people, with Jacopo's assent, who made Henry of Gorizia protector of Padua, putting Padua under the control of Frederick of Austria. Reinforced by the prince's army, the Paduans were now more than a match for Cangrande's forces.

Mussato, however, made it clear that the final victory over Cangrande was not the result of human endeavors. Although St. Justina, a Paduan saint, had begged Christ to intervene on the side of her people, He had already decided that the Paduans had suffered enough for their pride. His immediate answer to her plea was, "Your Paduan people will be content." Then, permitting the destruction of Cangrande's forces, He granted victory to the Paduans.[104]

Even though supernatural forces appeared to be the underlying causes behind most of the action, the citizens of Padua were the

---

[100] Ibid., col. 692e: "O civilis amor morti praelate potenti/ aeternum pro quo morientem vivere certum est."

[101] Ibid., col. 693b: "Ut cunctorum animae simul omnes corpore in uno/ et mens una foret defendere viribus urbem./ Nam quo tacta dabat signum campana tumultus/ illo tendebat subito gens illa volatu."

[102] Ibid., col. 694d.

[103] Ibid., col. 701b.

[104] Ibid., col. 711e.

central actors. While the nobility were the source of Paduan decadence in the drama, the people symbolized the city's vitality and promise. Although, as in the *Ecerinis*, Mussato occasionally distinguished between the mob and the citizens, in the narration of the city's defense all difference was erased: the Paduan people were one in their love of their homeland. Innocent of the selfseeking propensities of the nobility, the people's love of liberty made them willing to accept death to insure that liberty would not be lost. Nonetheless, the measure of Mussato's republican sentiments must be taken from his conclusion, when, after giving God thanks for their victory, the Paduans hailed Frederick, who they hoped would be the future Roman emperor.[105]

Mussato's thoughts about political constitutions were never clear, but at about the same time that he was writing the *De obsidione*, his younger friend, Marsilio Mainardini (1270/90–1342/43), also known as Marsilio of Padua, was bringing to completion what was doubtless the greatest work of political philosophy of the century.[106] Although primarily driven to construct a political order in which ecclesiastical power was limited to the spiritual realm, Marsilio, living a thousand miles from his homeland, created in his *Defensor pacis* a theory of government deeply marked by his earlier experience as a citizen of

[105] Ibid., col. 714bc: "Vocibus acclamant, Fridericum vivere regem/ augustum et magnae rostris considere Romae."

[106] The most complete bibliography of Marsilio is found in Johannes Haller, "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Marsilius von Padua," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 48 (1929): 166–97. The text of Marsilio's *Defensor pacis* was edited by C.W. Previté-Orton (Cambridge, 1928). An excellent English translation of the work is found in *Marsilius of Padua: The Defender of Peace*, ed. Alan Gewirth, vol. 2 (New York, 1951). Marsilio's two minor works have recently been edited: *Marsile de Padoue: Oeuvres mineures: Defensor Minor; De translatione imperii*, ed. C. Jeudy and J. Quillet (Paris, 1979), with French translation. An English translation of both texts is found in *Writings on the Empire: Defensor minor and De translatione imperii*, trans. C.J. Nederman (Cambridge, 1993). Perhaps the best single discussion of Marsilio's work within an Italian context is Nicolai Rubinstein, "Marsilius of Padua and Italian Political Thought of His Time," in *Europe in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. J.R. Hale, J.R.L. Highfield, and B. Smalley (Evanston, 1965), 44–75. See also Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (London and New York, 1978), 1:53–65.

On Mussato's friendship with Marsilio, see Novati, "Nuovi aneddoti sul cenacolo letterario padovano del primissimo Trecento," in *Scritti storici in memoria di Giovanni Monticolo* (Venice, 1922), 178; Haller, "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Marsilius von Padua," throughout; and Georges de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du Moyen Age*, 3rd ed., 5 vols. (Louvain, 1956–70), 2:21–29.

the commune of Padua and its secular intellectual atmosphere.[107] Arguing that temporal power derived from a single source, the popular will, and that it remained responsible to that will no matter what the particular form of government exercising power (*pars principans*), the Paduan philosopher relied on Aristotle and on the writings of some of his own scholastic predecessors, such as John of Paris, for elements of his theoretical framework.[108]

Using scholastic Latin – a language crafted for philosophical and theoretical purposes – Marsilio reached a level of conceptualization of republicanism far beyond the civic notions articulated in literary Latin by Lovato or Mussato. Nevertheless, the *Defensor pacis* was written within the context of the contemporary struggle of secular rulers against papal claims to exercise a supervisory role over temporal affairs, and the book's analysis of spiritual–temporal relations tended to overshadow its republican thrust. The major motive for the Tuscan translation of the work in 1363 seems to have been its antipapal arguments.[109] Some chapters of the *Defensor pacis*, moreover, suggested a preference for monarchy, and the work's interpretation of the development of Roman history was by and large traditional.[110] Although Marsilio considered Caesar a tyrant, he did not question the legitimacy of Augustus or his successors.[111] The ease with which the political foundation elaborated in the *Defensor* could be adapted to the justification of imperial monarchy in his later *Defensor minor* helps to explain why the *Defensor pacis* played no significant role in subse-

[107] Nicolai Rubinstein, "Marsilius of Padua," 46–50. Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:56–65, also stresses the relationship between the Italian background and Marsilio's thought. See also the revealing article by Paolo Marangon, "Marsilio tra preumanesimo e cultura delle arti," in his *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare*, 280–410.

[108] Besides the bibliography already mentioned on Marsilio's thought, see Jeannine Quillet, *La philosophie politique de Marsile de Padoue* (Paris, 1970), and C.J. Nederman, *Community and Consent: The Secular Political Theory of Marsiglio of Padua's Defensor Pacis* (Lanham, Md., 1995).

[109] An anonymous Florentine translated Marsilio's work into Tuscan in 1363: *Defensor pacis nella tradizione in volgare fiorentino del 1363*, ed. Carlo Pincin (Turin, 1966). From the marginal comments, it appears that the primary interest of the text was its confutation of papal primacy. Cf. Philip Jones, *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria* (Oxford, 1997), 465. The earliest demonstrable influence of Marsilio's writings was also in ecclesiology. For Marsilio's relationship to conciliar thought and especially to Nicholas of Cusa, see Paul Sigmund, "The Influence of Marsilius of Padua on Fifteenth-Century Conciliarism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23 (1962): 392–402.

[110] Rubinstein, "Marsilius of Padua," 69.

[111] *De translatione imperii*, in *Marsilio de Padoue: Oeuvres mineures*, 378 and 380.

quent discussions of republicanism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

As we shall see in the next chapter, although he constructed a less ambitious theory, the Tuscan Dominican Ptolemy of Lucca had employed similar scholastic language a quarter of a century earlier than Marsilio Mainardini in setting forth his own argument for the superiority of republican government to monarchy. By contrast, republicanism in Mussato remained at best a sentiment. Despite the republican tenor of much Trecento humanist thought, humanism would have to await Bruni, in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, for a full-fledged formulation of republican theory.

5

Mussato's efforts to synthesize his views on historical causation in his later writings, the *De lite* and *De traditione Patavii*, may have provided the background for the religious conversion reflected in his last series of poems, *Soliloquia*. Close to death, he used this poetry to abjure his former passion for pagan learning and, professing himself a true Christian, to place his eloquence in the service of the Triune God.

Lovato dei Lovati's writings give no evidence that he ever thought deeply about his faith. He provided an insight into his beliefs when he affirmed:

> I want nothing except to enjoy happy times, and when sweet things are lacking, to die sweetly.[112]

Similarly, none of Mussato's writings until the *Ecerinis* (ca. 1315), written when he was already fifty-six years old, suggest that he was any more devout than his mentor. Mussato was not irreligious, but religion did not seem to have left much of an imprint on his life. As with Lovato, pagan mythological associations tended to dilute and confuse Christian ideas and expressions and to make a jumble of religious notions.

The *Ecerinis*, however, was unquestionably a Christian drama. In it, Mussato deliberately neutralized pagan concepts, such as astral determination and chance. He did so by scattering throughout the play appeals to the Christian god as ruler of a divinely ordered world.

[112] See above, 98.

In rejecting the advice of fra Luca to surrender himself to Christ (lines 376–79), Ezzelino impudently dared to claim that he served the avenging God of the Old Testament (380–85). His ruin revealed the fate of those relying on Satan's power to achieve their goals. The religious dimension of the work, though, probably derived more from the formal requirements of tragedy than from the author's need to express personal convictions. It is difficult to know how he could have done otherwise, in a genre where divine interventions were standard elements. Although he cannot be suspected of religious skepticism nor of cynically translating classical tragedy into Christian terms to please an audience, religious concerns nevertheless do not seem to have been foremost in his mind.

I say this because a number of compositions he wrote around this time indicate a less than fervent Christian faith. In his confessional poem of 1317, despairing of the future in the light of his past failings, he sought neither help nor consolation in religion. Even more telling are four metric letters, written between the first coronation of Mussato as poet in December 1315 and a second in 1316, when the *Ecerinis* was performed a second time. In those letters, he defended ancient poetry against critics who considered it inimical to Christianity. Of the four letters, the most detailed one (18) was addressed to fra Giovannino da Mantova, who late in 1315 or early in 1316 preached against Mussato and attacked poetry along with other secular arts not only as valueless for Christians but even dangerous.[113]

---

[113] On Giovannino da Mantova, see L. Gargan, *Lo studio teologico e la biblioteca dei domenicani a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento* (Padua, 1971), 8–10.

The four letters are found in *Epistolae*, in Mussato, *Opera*, fasc. 4, pp. 39–42 (letter 1); 48–50 (letter 4); 54–56 (letter 7); and 76–80 (letter 18). *Epistola* 1, addressed to the College of Artists of the Paduan *studio*, and written in December 1316, on the first anniversary of Mussato's coronation, has already been discussed. *Epistolae* 4 and 7 were both sent to Giovanni da Vigonza in Venice. *Epistola* 1 alludes to the coronation and was probably written in 1316. Because Mussato's priapic poetry was known to Lovato, *Epistola* 7, entitled "In laudem poetice ad dominum Ioannem de Viguntia simulantem se abhorruisse seria Priapeie," has usually been dated to before 1309. Guido Billanovich, however, "Il preumanesimo," 75–76, assumes by the nature of its arguments that the letter belongs to a period immediately after the coronation. *Epistola* 18 offers Mussato's second rebuttal of Giovannino's charges. The latter's response to an earlier letter of Mussato, now lost, with a summary of Mussato's points, is found in *Epistolae*, 70–75.

Mussato's defense of poetry has been the subject of a good deal of scholarship since the beginning of this century. See Karl Vossler, *Poetische Theorien in der italienischen Frührenaissance*, Litterarhistorische Forschungen, no. 12 (Berlin, 1900), 5–12; Alfredo Galletti, "La 'ragione poetica' di Albertino Mussato ed i poeti-theologi,"

In all four letters, Mussato appropriated Aristotle's conception of the poet–theologian (*Metaph.*, 1:3, 983b 28–30). Poetry was a divine science for Mussato because it privileged the gods and celestial things. Like the Holy Bible, it was inspired by God:

> The work of art deals with nothing less than divine beings. This science was sent down from high Heaven and has its place next to God on high.[114]

Whereas Genesis described the origins of the universe in prose, "the secret muse teaches with greater obscurity" (line 48). Other parallels between the poets' teachings and Christian revelation showed that poets, like the Chosen People, had been recipients of truths from God revealing something of His true nature: "Our whole faith is predicted by holy Maro" [Virgil].[115] The poet's references to various "gods" should not be taken literally. Rather, Mussato wrote, the references were a way of praising in death human beings who in life had attained distinction. Christians did the same thing, only they preferred to call their dead heroes "saints."[116] Both the poets and prophets, moreover, realized that men were drawn to mysteries:

---

in *Scritti varii di erudizione e di critica in onore di Rudolfo Renier* (Turin, 1912), 1–58; Ernst R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, 1963), 214–21; Gustavo Vinay, "Studi sul Mussato: I. Il Mussato e l'estetica medievale," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 126 (1949): 113–59; A. Buck, *Italienische Dichtungslehren vom Mittelalter bis zum Ausgang der Renaissance*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, no. 94 (1952): 69–72; M. Dazzi, *Il Mussato preumanista*, 108–23; Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 71–78; G. Ronconi, *Le origini delle dispute umanistiche sulla poesia (Mussato e Petrarca)* (Rome, 1976); and R. Witt, "Coluccio Salutati and the Conception of the *Poeta Theologus* in the Fourteenth Century," *Renaissance Quarterly* 30 (1977): 540–42.

[114] *Epistolae*, 4, lines 44–46; 49.

[115] "Nostra fides sancto tota est predicta Maroni," quoted by Giovannino da Mantua from Mussato's first (now lost) letter to him (*Epistolae*, 71). In his rebuttal, the friar attacked the method of applying the words of the poets to ideas of which they had never dreamed. To confirm his own position, he used the authority of Jerome, who unequivocally denied that Virgil was "a Christian without Christ" (73). Mussato, obviously unwilling to oppose the authority of Jerome on this issue, replied (*Epistolae*, lines 169–71; 79): "Haec data desursum vatem cecinisse putabam/ Grata mihi nimium monitus sed corrigor. Unde/ sit vix ille Deus, quem sic monstraverat." Yet obviously still cherishing the belief in the direct inspiration of God on the ancient poets, he continued (lines 170–74): "Absit/ ut prorsus credam dominum verumque, bonumque/ Hieronymo nolente Deum, staboque Prophetis/ quantumcumque suis lateant aenigmata dictis."

[116] *Epistolae*, letter 18, p. 77, lines 49–50.

> Mystical words attract good men; wondrous poetry makes them more attentive when it signifies something other than what the words mean.[117]

Like pagan poetry, much of the Bible was in meter and required an allegorical interpretation to be understood.

Mussato's belief that the best ancient poetry was the product of divine inspiration allied him with Christian apologetic tradition. What distinguished his account from earlier Christian defenses was the thoroughness of the parallel that he drew between poetry and Scripture and the confidence with which he drew it, apparently oblivious to poetry's encroachment on Scripture's domain. Abroad in the world since the beginning of time, Divine Providence had employed the poets to reveal obscurely particular truths that only later became manifest. The poet, therefore, was truly a *vates* or vessel (*vas*) of God. His creations were only partly his own.[118] The overall effect of Mussato's defense was to blur the distinction between poetry and theology and to stress the continuity between ancient poetry and the Bible: the poets adumbrated truths that were subsequently enunciated with greater clarity in the Gospels.

As the hierarchy of causal forces governing human life became clearer to Mussato during the 1320s, however, his sense of the peculiar and superior character of the Christian religion grew acute, and his syncretic tendencies diminished. Inconsistencies still existed in the *De obsidione* – the fates (*Parcae*) and chance (*casus*), for example, were not neatly tied into a Christian causal framework – but an epic poem is not a forum amenable to a synthetic presentation of a theory of causation. In any case, by the conclusion of the poem, Mussato made the relationship between human and divine agency clear: on the human level, a people fought to preserve its liberty, while God, personified as Christ, first created Cangrande as punishment for Paduan pride and then, satisfied with the intensity of Padua's suffering, decreed that he be vanquished.

The *Soliloquia*, Mussato's last surviving poems, demonstrate the extent to which a Christian focus had come to dominate the elderly

---

[117] *Epistolae*, letter 7, p. 54, lines 2–4.

[118] *Epistolae*, letter 7, p. 54, line 20. Only with qualification, therefore, can one accept the judgment of Giuseppe Saitta, *Il pensiero italiano nell'Umanesimo e nel Rinascimento*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1961), 1:11, that Mussato's position leads to "una commossa esaltazione della potenza creatrice dello spirito umano."

humanist's life by 1328–29. A series of seven poems dedicated respectively to the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, Mary, St. Paul, the Cross, Christ's Passion, and the Old and New testaments, the *Soliloquia* represented a conscious rejection of Lovato's poetic heritage. In *Soliloquium* 3, the poet turned from the false pagan goddesses, Minerva and Venus, to the Virgin Mother "by whose help no one's faith has been rejected." Repenting for past infidelity to Mary, Mussato declared:

> Not Jove nor his sister and wife, Juno, are spoken of here. The vain fable departs from my mind and I pass over the gods worshipped in error, who lie dead with their despised posterity.[119]

His *Soliloqium* 5, on Christ's Passion, amounts to nothing short of a rejection of the Muses to whom so much of his earlier life had been devoted. Mussato had been redeemed by the wood of the Cross: in it lay his safety and succor.

> Flee, Calliope, and hold yourself at a distance from this place, Thalia. Minerva of the stage, withdraw with your muses. It serves to beg a suitable favor from the highest power, for our speech will be spiritual.[120]

Whereas once he celebrated fictions, he now sang the praises of Christ:

> Accordingly, I will not treat false poetry in metric and I will resound on the harp with praises of the Cross.[121]

Dominated by the lexicon and phraseology that had been the common coin of sacramental and homiletic language for centuries, almost totally shorn of classical associations, this poetry dramatically contrasted with Mussato's previous work.[122]

Although metrically correct, the *Soliloquia* betrayed the aesthetic of *vetustas* and rejected the notion of compatibility between pagan and Christian cultures that had facilitated the literary and scholarly achievements of Lovato and Mussato himself. Mussato's new Christianity was pre-emptive and uncompromising. If he had any deep

---

[119] *Soliloquia*, 3, in Mussato, *Opera*, fasc. 4, p. 103, lines 9–12: "Non Iovis hic Iuno soror, et narratur et uxor/ Decidit ex animo fabula vana meo:/ Et cultos errore Deos omitto, Deasque / qui cum despecta posteritate iacent."

[120] *Solil.* 5, p. 109, lines 56–58: "Effuge Calliope, procul hinc abscede Thalia/ scenica cum musis cede Minerva tuis./ Expedit hoc dignum summa de parte favorem/ Quaerere nam sermo spiritualis erit."

[121] Ibid., p. 107, lines 97–98.

[122] For occasional mythological references, see Guido Billanovich, "Il preumanesimo padovano," 81.

spiritual insight to express, he buried it beneath heaps of pious platitudes. The sanctimonious tone revealed the foreboding of the poet, who, with fervent religiosity, endeavored to compensate in these last days for a lifetime of failure to meet Christian standards. He could no longer ignore the lines of cause and effect crisscrossing the universe in a hierarchy ending in the Christian God; he felt a need to place himself within the protective embrace of His everlasting arms. Late in life, with little room left for maneuvering, Mussato saw no alternative but to trust in Christ's mercy.

Mussato's political ambitions and the isolation of exile doubtless intensified his late religious crisis. Perhaps for the first time, he clearly saw the problematic character of his youthful efforts to integrate his literary and scholarly interests with Christian beliefs. Like his earlier critic, Giovannino, he had come to consider his former devotion to ancient poetry indefensible within the context of medieval piety.

Petrarch, who became aware of the tension between the two cultures early in his career, comes immediately to mind. Much of Petrarch's insistent searching for bridges between the ancients and moderns derived from his own deep ambivalence. By the 1350s, having identified the problems and reconciled himself to persistent incongruities, Petrarch appears to have reassured himself that his humanism was compatible with his Christian faith. While to the modern observer Petrarch's amalgamation of the two cultures may appear contrived, he himself seems to have genuinely felt that he had Christianized humanism, as did the next generation of humanists, who borrowed from him with both hands. As the near-deathbed confession of Coluccio Salutati would show, however, the tensions were not always resolved easily.

6

Although Padua from the time of Lovato was the most important center of the new studies, by Mussato's generation other cities were sharing its scholarly interests. Throughout Lovato's and Mussato's generations, Venice remained generally inhospitable to humanism but was not completely immune to the attraction of the new poetry.[123] In 1316, the allegedly miraculous birth in captivity of three

[123] In his letter to Henry VII of 1311/12, Mussato had criticized the Venetians for their lack of interest in letters: "There are no prizes there for the Apollonian god."

lion cubs spurred a flurry of poetic activity designed to capitalize on what appeared to be a favorable augury for the city. Intending to provoke a response from Mussato, a certain maestro Giovanni, probably a Paduan teaching in Venice, addressed a poetic letter to the doge in which he speculated on the meaning of the miracle.[124]

Speaking in the persona of the celestial Muse Urania, Mussato pronounced that the birth was natural, while at the same time suggesting that the event augured well for the city. At this point, the aged Venetian chancellor, Tanto, entered the discussion by composing two poems. In the first, he asked Mussato to expand on Urania's predictions; in the second, he provided astrological data about the births. In the first poem, Tanto criticized Mussato's poem for using *sopita* with a short *o*. In his reply, obviously wounded by the criticism, Mussato justified his metrical usage and pointed out a host of errors in the metric of Tanto's own poetic epistle. In two subsequent poems, Tanto endeavored to exculpate himself through a variety of rhetorical stratagems. He must have regretted having raised the issue in the first place.[125]

In contrast with Venice, the new studies developed quickly in Padua's mainland sister cities, Vicenza and Verona. Benvenuto Campesani (1250/55–1323), a Vicentine notary and poet, had known Lovato at least since the latter served as *podestà* of Vicenza in 1291–92.[126] Mussato so respected the Vicentine that he appealed to

---

See also the complaints of his friend Zambono d'Andrea from his exile in Venice: Poem 33, in *Lupati de Lupatis*, 33–35. Nonetheless, the two foreigners who wrote extensive literary works praising the city in this period probably expected to be compensated in some way: about 1300, Pace da Ferrara composed his *Descriptio festi gloriosissime Virginis Marie*, dedicated to Pietro Gradenigo, doge of Venice; and in 1333 Castellano da Bassano, teaching in Venice since 1322, wrote his *Poema Venetianae pacis inter Ecclesiam et Imperatorem*. Castellano's poem is found in G. Monticolo and A. Segarizzi, *RIS*, new ser., 22.4 (Città di Castello, 1906), 485–519. Mussato himself may have been seeking patronage in writing the adulatory letter to Doge Soranzo between 1314 and 1318. For the date, see Monticolo, "Poesie latine," 268.

[124] Monticolo, "Poesie latine," 250.

[125] The interchanges are narrated by Monticolo, ibid., 251–53 and 260–65. The correspondence of the three participants are published on pp. 270–91. See also Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo*, 4–5.

[126] Roberto Weiss, "Benvenuto Campesani (1250/55?–1323)," *Bollettino del Museo civico di Padova* 44 (1955): 129–44; and G. Gorni, "Campesani (Campesanus, de Campexanis, de Campesanis, Campigena), Benvenuto," *DBI* 17 (Rome, 1974), 493–96.

Campesani's judgment after Zambono had decided against him in the debate with Lovato over the value of having children. Zambono's own letter to Campesani, intended to head off Mussato's appeal, shows that he too was well-acquainted with Campesani and esteemed him highly.

Campesani's poem dedicated to Cangrande and castigating Padua for attacking Verona in 1311 must have cooled relations between its author and Mussato. Encouraged to respond by Paolo da Teolo, a Paduan judge, Mussato delivered a poetic diatribe against Campesani. Nonetheless, after Campesani's death, in response to a request by Ferreto Ferreti, a disciple of the deceased scholar, Mussato composed a commemorative poem (now lost).[127]

Almost nothing remains of Campesani's writings: a few fragments of the poem praising Cangrande and an enigmatic epigram celebrating the recovery of Catullus. Ferreto refers to a narrative poem recounting the long war begun in 1273 between Venice and the Patriarch of Aquileia for control of the Istrian Peninsula, but it has not survived.[128] Campesani's subjects for his poems, however, reveal the character of his humanism. Like the Paduans, he intended to put his classicizing style to use in treating contemporary issues and events. Unlike them, his interests in pagan culture were probably limited to pagan poetry, and he seems to have done nothing in the way of philological work on ancient texts.[129]

Campesani's student, Ferreto (1294–1337), also a notary, similarly applied his stylistic talents and learning to current affairs. Like the older Mussato, he began writing poetry and later wrote prose. His major surviving poem, *Carmen de Scaligerorum origine*, designed to respond to Mussato's various attacks on Cangrande, was at the same time primarily historical.[130] He also wrote a priapic poem, of which all but a fragment has perished.[131] Ferreto began his prose history of

---

[127] *Le opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti vicentino*, ed. Carlo Cipolla, FSI, vols. 42–44 (Rome, 1908–20), 3:109–11. On Mussato's verses for Campesani, see Weiss, "Benvenuto Campesani," 139.

[128] *Opere*, 2:269–70.

[129] This is the opinion of Roberto Weiss, "La cultura preumanistica veronese e vicentina nel tempo di Dante," in *Dante e la cultura veneta* (Florence, 1966), 269.

[130] The history is found in volume 3 of *Le opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti vicentino*. The most comprehensive treatment of Ferreto remains Max Laue, *Ferreto von Vicenza: Seine Dichtungen und sein Geschichtswerk* (Halle, 1884).

[131] The surviving lines are published by Cipolla, *Le opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti vicentino*, 3:115.

recent Italian political events about 1330, just after the death of Mussato, whom he mentions reverently in the introduction to his *Historia rerum in Italia gestarum.*[132]

In an effort to set the stage for his narration of events surrounding Henry VII's three years in Italy, Ferreto provided an extensive summary of Italian secular and ecclesiastical affairs from the death of Frederick II in 1250 to 1318. A detailed account of the Italian campaign of Henry VII between 1310 and 1313 followed and finally a narration of political events in the five years after Henry's death. In the last section, the treatment of Vicentine politics played a substantial role.

Unfortunately, the limited corpus of Ferreto, who died relatively young, makes it difficult to compare his political and religious views with those of Mussato. Although Ferreto does not seem to have held communal government in high regard, he outspokenly condemned tyranny. But whereas Mussato viewed Ezzelino as the ancestor of another tyrant, Cangrande della Scala, Ferreto treated the latter in his *Carmen* as the antithesis of Ezzelino. Writing with the *Ecerinis* very much in mind, Ferreto portrayed Cangrande as a force for peace and order and as an alternative to tyranny on the one hand and communal factionalism on the other.[133] Nevertheless, his assessment of della Scala's power was not completely positive.[134]

Ferreto paid the greatest honor to Mussato by inserting passages from the Paduan's historical writings in his own history.[135] But he differed from his model in explicitly assigning a didactic function to history. Faithful to the dominant medieval tradition of historical writing, Mussato did not feel it necessary to stress the link between history and morality. In contrast, Ferreto prefaced his *Historia rerum in Italia gestarum* by explaining the value of history for teaching morality and the need for divine grace in achieving that purpose.[136] He con-

[132] *Le opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti*, vols. 1 and 2.

[133] Carlo Cipolla, "Studi su Ferreto dei Ferreti," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 6 (1885): 101–12, describes the influence of Mussato's poem on Ferreto.

[134] Giovanni Filippi, "Politica e religiosità di Ferreto dei Ferreti," *Archivo veneto* 32 (1886): 309–13, for his political sentiments. For an outline of the contents of the poem, see Guido Manera, *Ferreto dei Ferreti, preumanista vicentino* (Vicenza, 1949), 10–28.

[135] Dazzi, "Il Mussato storico," 407.

[136] *Historia rerum in Italia gestarum*, 1:7–8: "Nunc autem cum idem vita defecerit, dignumque sit tam strenua facta, quanta nostris temporibus confluxere, celebri memoria decorari, statuimus ea, quantum divini Spiritus gratia suffragabit, novis litteris

fided that Mussato had taught him that writing history was a moral responsibility, and he asked for divine grace in carrying out the mission.

Ferreto's style was less periodic than Mussato's. He tended to develop his narrative by accumulating clauses, following the temporal succession of events. In a passage paralleling Mussato's account of Henry VII's attack on Brescia, which I analyzed earlier, Ferreto wrote:

> Disturbed by these worries, mounting a horse, he led the cardinals with him through the camp for an inspection, so that he might stimulate the failing energies of his troops more boldly for an attack, and then, after eating, at almost the sixth hour, with the forces and arms of the Germans and Italians made ready, he ordered an attack on the enemy with weapons ....[137]

The sometimes tortured, exuberant structures of Mussato's text have been unpacked and simplified. While Ferreto's Latin had shed many of its associations with *dictamen*, he remained loyal to the medieval *cursus*, and his lexicon was less classical than Mussato's.[138] Although clearer, Ferreto's style lacked Mussato's immediacy and concentrated vigor. At least for the modern reader, Ferreto's delight in making frequent interjections impedes rather than enhances his account of events.[139]

---

illustrare, ne, si steriles in ocio torpeamus, sacre virtutis opera destituisse videamur." Filippi highlights the expressions of Christian sentiments and ideas in Ferreto's work ("Politica e religiosità," 313–24). These expressions are intermingled with others of pagan inspiration (ibid., 317–19). On his moralizing, see Manera, *Ferreto dei Ferreti*, 31. Like Mussato, Ferreto has fate, fortune, and astral forces operating as causes, but he makes no effort to order them as did Mussato (Filippi, "Politica e religiosità," 324–26).

[137] *Historia rerum in Italia gestarum*, 1:348: "His iactatus Cesar animi pressuris, equo subvectus, per castra, visendi causa, cardinales secum ducit, utque suorum languentes impetus ad pugnam audentius erigat, dein sumpto cibo, hora pene sexta, paratis Wandalorum Ytalorumque copiis et armis, hostes impeti telis imperat ...." For the classical sources influencing Ferreto, see Laue, *Ferreto von Vicenza*, 6–11. Ferreto's "His iactatus Cesar animi pressuris" represents direct borrowing from the first lines of Mussato's account of the same episode.

[138] Ferreto's use of *cursus* was 78 per cent, exactly that of Rolandino (see appendix). For Ferreto's lexicon, note in the passage cited *equo subiectus* and a few lines above the cited passage *in seriem* for "continually" and *promotus* for "agitated".

[139] In describing Henry VII's effort to subjugate Rome in 1312, for example, he writes (2:50): "sicque, incendio passim evagante, usque in locum, qui Minerva nuncupatur, ubi Predicatorum sacer ordo devotis ymnorum iubilis ante aras Deo psallit ...." Or immediately below, in describing the capture of the Capitoline hill: "locus ille quondam Iovi natoque veterum ritu dedicatus, Cesarum sedes inclita,

During much of Mussato's later life, contact between Padua and scholars of a third mainland Veneto city, Verona, were strained because of the intrigues of the della Scala family, especially during the rule of Ferreto's hero, Cangrande. Scholarly activity was less enterprising in Verona than in Padua. Although Dante spent a number of years there during his exile, the city did not host many foreign scholars. Perhaps the absence of political debates in the city of the della Scala inhibited the development of intense intellectual interchange. In any case, while Veronese scholars followed the new philological approach to the ancient texts that had been pioneered by Lovato, their interests were primarily antiquarian and centered on the pagan and ecclesiastical writings in the cathedral library. Unlike the scholars of Vicenza, the Veronese apparently had no interest in the classicizing aspect of Paduan humanism.[140]

Giovanni de Matociis (d. 1337), notary and *mansionarius* or sacristan of the cathedral, was the only well-known native Veronese scholar.[141] Of five works ascribed to him, two, his *Vetus testamentum* and a life of St. Athanasius, are lost. The other three are the *Historia imperialis*, the *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Pliniis*, and the *Gesta romanorum pontificum*, which exists only in fragmentary form in one manuscript. Designed to cover the years from Augustus Caesar down to his own day, the *Historia imperialis* seems to have been completed as far as Charlemagne.[142]

Relying on various patristic works, the acts of councils, and an-

---

facile capitur." Cf. Giacomo Zanella, "Di Ferreto de' Ferreti, storico e poeta vicentino: Memoria," in his *Scritti varii di Giacomo Zanella* (Florence, 1877), 99–101.

[140] Roberto Weiss, "La cultura preumanista," 263–64, writes: "A Verona per tante ragioni non vi è al tempo di Dante ciò che potremmo chiamare un umanesimo rettorico e comunale. Vi è invece un umanesimo che non si esprime nella storia contemporanea e nella versificazione latina, un umanesimo erudito, che si basa esclusivamente sulle risorse libresche della cattedrale, che alterna lo studio dei grandi antichi a quello degli scrittori ecclesiastici e Plinio a san Zeno, e dove l'orgoglio patrio si manifesta non nella rettorica, ma nello studio di scrittori veronesi o reputati tali."

[141] For details of his life, see Weiss, 265–67, and Claudia Adami, "Per la biografia di Giovanni Mansionario," *IMU* 25 (1982): 347–63. See also her "Per la biografia di Giovanni Mansionario: La questione di San Vito di Lusia," in *Petrarca, Verona e l'Europa: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Verona, 19–23 sett. 1991)*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich and Giuseppe Frasso, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 26 (Padua, 1997), 69–88.

[142] Rino Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," *SCV* 2:119–20, summarizes the situation of the manuscripts and editions of his works. On the *Historiae imperiales*, see also G. Bottari, "Giovanni Mansionario nella cultura veronese del Trecento," in *Petrarca, Verona e l'Europa*, 21–68.

cient and early medieval historical writings, all available in the cathedral library, Giovanni compiled his *Historia imperialis* in the second decade of the fourteenth century in a nondescript, unadorned Latin "not yet animated with the vivifying breath of humanism."[143] In the use of his sources, however, he exhibited a new critical sense. Realizing that his manuscript was corrupted, he transposed sections of the ancient *Historia augusta*, a work he was perhaps the first to identify. He refuted those who claimed that Constantine had only been baptized at the end of his life, and he demolished a number of saints' legends. His greatest philological feat was his *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Pliniis*, composed between 1320 and 1328. In that short work, he proved that the single Pliny of the Middle Ages was actually two, uncle and nephew.[144]

Although he lived in Verona only from 1328 until his death in 1333, Benzo da Alessandria is usually associated with Verona because of the character of his scholarship. By 1320, before coming to Verona, he had already completed the first third of his immense *Cronica*, a history of the world from the creation down to Henry VII, modeled on Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum historiale*. Benzo labored to finish the remainder for much of the rest of his life.[145] Like Petrarch, Benzo had spent many years searching in various cities for manuscripts that he needed for his research. He had already visited the cathedral library at Verona sometime before 1328 and had found, among other rare works, Catullus, Ausonius, and the *Historia augusta*.[146]

In a general way, Benzo was conscious of a disparity between ancient Latin and contemporary Latin, but he had no intention of taking the former as his model. In cases where he cited ancient poetry as source material, he reduced it to prose and substituted more recent vocabulary for ancient words in order to make its mean-

[143] The phrase belongs to Weiss, "La cultura preumanistica," 267.

[144] Avesani, "Il preumanisimo veronese," *SCV* 2:120–21, n. 37, provides editions and bibliography.

[145] For details of his life, see Weiss, "La cultura preumanista," 267–68; and Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," 2:116–18. Of three divisions of the *Cronica*, only the first survives. For its contents, see Joseph R. Berrigan, "The Prehumanism of Benzo d'Alessandria," *Traditio* 25 (1969): 249–63. Berrigan has published a portion of the work: "Benzo d'Alessandria and the Cities of Northern Italy," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 4 (1967): 125–92.

[146] Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," 2:116–18.

ing more accessible.[147] Despite his *Cronica*'s diction and its encyclopedic approach, so medieval in character, Benzo, like de Matociis, developed rigorous techniques in textual criticism. He endeavored to find the most reliable witnesses for his account and when they contradicted one another, he discussed the disagreements and then chose the most likely position. He also entertained the possibility that some of the contradictions were conscious distortions on the part of the writers. Historians for him were more reliable than poets. He did not hesitate to compare readings from different manuscripts and to admit obscurity in his sources when he found it. He scrupulously quoted from ancient and medieval texts.[148]

Like Geremia da Montagnone in Padua, de Matociis and Benzo should not be considered humanists. All three men, and especially the latter two, gave proof of having a new critical mentality toward their sources and an incipient sense of anachronism. But whereas Lovato's study of Seneca's meters prepared the way for Mussato's Senecan-style patriotic tragedy, in Verona the philological progress of scholars remained culturally inert until they could be translated into the new classicizing medium. Philological research, the identification of texts and authors, and the reconstruction of segments of ancient history were vital to the development of humanism, but they could only become humanistic when contributing to the reconstruction of a society of human beings and their distinctive patterns of thought and feeling. The revivifying process stemmed from the humanists' effort to recreate the style that encoded the emotions and thoughts of ancient society.

Only one northern Italian scholar and writer outside the Veneto, Giovanni da Cermenate (d. ca. 1344), contributed to humanism in Mussato's generation. He may have had links to Padua through Lovato's Milanese friend, Bissolo, but that is only a guess. Like Mussato and Ferreto, he was inspired by Henry VII's arrival in Italy to write history.[149] Cermenate's account, finished about 1322, seems to have been written in ignorance of Mussato's *Historia augusta*, fin-

[147] Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:135. The rest of this paragraph draws on ibid., 2:134–36.

[148] An anonymous manuscript completed in 1329 and referred to as the *Verona Florilegium* provides another example of the kind of antiquarian scholarship cultivated in Verona (Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," 2:121–22).

[149] The work is published in *Historia Johannis de Cermenate, notarii mediolanensis de situ Ambrosianae urbis et cultoribus ipsius et circumstantium locorum*, ed. L.A. Ferrai, FSI, no. 2 (Rome, 1889). G. Soldi Rondinini, "Cermenate, Giovanni," *DBI* 23 (Rome, 1979), 768–71, brings together what little we know of the historian's life.

ished by 1315.[150] Cermenate's narration of world history from Noah down to modern times (5–19) demonstrated his affinity with the traditions of medieval historiography. Psychological factors, prominent in Mussato and Ferreto, figured very little in Cermenate's explanation of events, and like Ferreto, he often impeded the narrative with needless details.[151]

His extensive plagiarizing from the first decade of Livy in the sections dealing with the early history of Rome indicates a commitment to reforming current Latin prose, albeit a heavyhanded one. When he wrote on his own without Livy as his subtext, however, his style was marked by the frequent use of the present participle, minimal reliance on the subjunctive, and the construction of short clauses. Cermenate's main innovation was his aggressive effort to eliminate the *cursus* from his prose. While Ferreto remained loyal to traditional rules of *cursus* and Mussato's percentage was low enough to suggest he avoided it, Cermenate's percentage, 41.5 percent of his period endings, indicates a clear refusal to adhere to the old rules.[152] While it is perhaps unfair to compare Ferreto with Cermenate in that the former had Mussato's work available as a model, nonetheless, of the three historians of Henry VII's expedition, Cermenate was the least gifted, and, with the exception of his rejection of the *cursus*, the most backward-looking stylistically.[153]

---

[150] For the date, see Rondinini, "Cermenate, Giovanni," 769. The work was finished about 1322.

[151] When, for example, he notes (116) that the Guelfs have captured Aimo de Biamont, one of the leaders of an expedition, Giovanni writes that Aimo "plurimum imperatori carus erat tum virtute animi, quae hominem Deo atque hominibus gratum reddit, tum sanguinis proximitate."

[152] See appendix. Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus* (152), maintains Bruni was the first to abandon use of the *cursus* in letter writing: Bruni "wäre damit der erste Schriftsteller unserer Untersuchungen, der den mittelalterlichen Cursus und bestimmte rhythmische Satzschlüsse in seinen Briefen nicht verwendet .... Mit Bruni kommt indessen etwas Neues, was in der Briefschreibekunst die mittelalterliche Tradition völlig brechen sollte, nämlich die Richtung, die von den modernen Gehlehrten Ciceronianismus genannt wird und von der Bruni einer der ersten Vorkämpfer sein soll."

The low percentage of *cursus* in Mussato's work and even lower in Cermenate's indicates that there was a strong reaction to its use much earlier and that it had nothing to do with the advent of Ciceronianism. Lindholm's conclusion is justified, however, if only letter writing is considered.

[153] Cermenate's long account of the history of the world beginning with Noah (5–19) down to the election of Henry VII as emperor does not show a historicist sensibility.

The early period of humanist historical writing, focused on contemporary events, began in 1315 and lasted little more than two decades. From the death of Ferreto in 1337 until Bruni's historical writings, no major work on modern history was produced by a humanist. Although none of Petrarch's major followers shared his melancholy about *tempora acta*, Petrarch turned the attention of his own and the following generation to an intense reconsideration of the ancient past. With the exception of a few minor works, humanist interest in contemporary history did not revive until Bruni began his history of Florence in the second decade of the fifteenth century.

7

In emulating the ancient writers, the humanists worked with the malleable material of their own culture, which was already challenging the restraints of inherited institutions and moral codes. In a sense the humanists only found in the ancients what they set out to look for, a model for the secular and urban morality already emerging from the vernacular and Latin culture of thirteenth-century Italy. Certainly one cannot credit the secularity of Lovato or (for most of his life) Mussato to ancient influences. Until the thirteenth century, almost all Latin literary poetry in northern and central Italy had been secular, and much of it remained so even afterwards. As for literary prose, the histories and ethical treatises written by *dictatores* outside of their daily work as notaries, teachers, and public officials were completely secular in character. A Christian lay writer like Albertano da Brescia was exceptional.

Nor can the lyrical, personal voice of much of the early humanist poets be directly attributed to their contacts with antiquity. Italians turned to the ancients because they already felt an affinity for them. The initial impetus for seeking self-expression in poetry derived, rather, from the diffusion of the Provençal lyric earlier in the century. While most contemporary Italian writers were content to capture the new literary form in their own vernacular, Lovato and a few others reached back to antiquity for direct inspiration.

If the humanists' secular orientation and their concern with self-expression in the first sixty to seventy years of what was to become a movement cannot be traced to their classicizing, scholarly interests, but rather presupposes those attitudes, how did the intensive renewal

of interest in antiquity affect the humanists' own way of thinking and perceiving their world? The medieval brand of secularism that the early humanists inherited was quite unreflective and served without confrontation a society whose professed assumptions rested on the existence of a Christian afterlife. But their intense exposure to the ancient poets drew these scholars into a pagan universe whose charms captivated them long before they understood much about the culture and society from which they emanated. Indeed, the major interest of the first two generations of humanists was not in historical Greece or Rome but rather in the permissive mythical world of gods and heroes of classical Latin poetry. For them, the ancient world existed as an emotional space, a domain of feeling.

In savoring the seductive figurings of unrestrained passions and in echoing them in their own work, both Lovato and Mussato unconsciously crossed a line, all but undemarcated in their time. To the last, Lovato seems to have ignored the trespass and died with an untroubled conscience. Ultimately, however, Mussato, openly attacked for paganism and beaten down by unrelenting afflictions, came to recognize his sins and repent.

The old secularity survived popularly into the fourteenth century, but by then a new, learned way of treating secularity, one glorified by a brilliant literature and contextualized within a historical framework, was gradually emerging to intrigue, tempt, and torment the next two generations of humanists, who struggled to accommodate it to the old dichotomy of "spiritual" and "temporal." A strong impetus for the humanists' development of historical perspective derived from their effort to objectify antiquity and, by separating themselves from it, to reduce its threat to Christian loyalties. That by the early 1400s humanists generally ceased to be preoccupied by the problem of reconciling their faith with pagan letters suggests that the process of objectification was well underway by that time.

The tools of analysis inherited from the ancient historians enabled the humanists to pursue the historical Rome, model of a secular society very unlike that of contemporary Europe generally. The striking superiority of Mussato to Rolandino in constructing a historical narrative revealed a new skill in dealing with temporality, one that could not have been derived from forms of Latin discourse currently in use in Italy. The commerce between Roman and local statute law absorbed most of the attention of Italian legal experts and, when lawyers entered a courtroom, their major intellectual concern was

fitting the proper law to the case. As for *ars dictaminis*, in imparting instruction on the five parts of the letter, manuals traditionally devoted the least attention to the *narratio*, the rubric that would have included history. Rolandino provides an illustrative example. When he set out to write a narrative history, his training in law and *dictamen* proved inadequate to the task. Nor was the highly sophisticated dialectic of Scholasticism, dealing largely with theological and scientific issues, even relevant.

In contrast, Mussato's ability to create a tightly woven, sequential account of an event like the attack on Brescia resulted from years of intense effort to master the techniques of ancient historians. From them, he learned how to articulate semantically complex historical phenomena by using clausal constructions to assign each semantic element its proper valence. Mussato's grasp of the various nuances of modes and tenses heightened his ability to capture the temporal relationships involved in constructing historical discourse.

The legacy of antiquity that Mussato recovered provided not only a method for describing temporal change but also a stimulus to inquire into its nature. With increased precision, he examined minutely the discrete moments that, taken serially, made up events that might otherwise have seemed monolithic and inaccessible to constructive scrutiny. Beyond contributing to his expressive power, Mussato's determined effort to imitate ancient Latin historical writing deepened and transformed his consciousness of the historical process. Rather than just providing a vehicle for communicating ideas that he already held, his study and imitation of antiquity both provoked him and enabled him to refine his understanding of temporality, much as the ancients, manipulating the Latin of their day, had learned to do in their work.

Mussato's new awareness extended beyond his historical writing to a broader realization that his own life was a historical event measurable in years, months, and days. Vague, traditional, periodic concepts such as youth, manhood, and old age still had purchase with him, but alternatively he envisaged his life as the sum of a temporal series of memories of internal and external events. This was a new kind of self-identity constructed from the ordered sequencing of personal experiences. Establishing one's own place in the temporal flow was an essential step in the genesis of historical perspective.

In the next generation, the implications of considering one's life experience as a continuity of precisely defined temporal units would

hit Petrarch with their full force. Preoccupied with time, desperately anxious about its measured passage, compulsively autobiographical, Petrarch obsessively returned to his own past, even to the extent that, in giving it an elaborated structure, he creatively rearranged it. His excursions into his past served him variously: partly to reckon the value of his previous use of time, partly to orient him toward its improved use in the future, and partly as a backdrop for the moral lessons that he wanted to impart to his readers. But they also served the less obvious purpose of reaffirming his present being by recapitulating his past and, by embroidering on it, flattering his urge to control time. Unlike for his spiritual hero, Augustine, the transcendent eternal remained for Petrarch an abstraction. His autobiographical constructions did not serve him (as they had the ancient Church Fathers) to overcome time, but rather to anchor him more deeply in a transitory if defined place within its flow.

Chapter 2 argued that the similarity of political and cultural life between thirteenth-century Italy and the ancients encouraged the humanists to assimilate the earlier culture. For much the same reason, scholars in Tuscany looked to the classics as well, but they took a different approach. Exponents of the Tuscan vernacular, such as Brunetto Latini, were attracted to the ancient pagan texts because they too saw them as a way of conceptualizing their civic life. Nevertheless, Latini and others approached the texts through translation into the Florentine vernacular, a language in formation. The next chapter will examine in more detail the character of three possible approaches to the ancient texts, the classicizing, scholastic, and vernacular. In comparison with contemporary Padua, Florence in the early fourteenth century appears to have been something of a cultural backwater for study of the ancient Latin writers. That the city emerged as the capital of humanism by 1400 becomes a puzzling phenomenon.

CHAPTER FIVE

FLORENCE AND VERNACULAR LEARNING

By the early fourteenth century, Florence was one of the largest cities in western Europe. While agriculture remained the most significant source of revenue for the inhabitants of the city, commerce and industry were not far behind.[1] A relatively minor Italian commune earlier in the Middle Ages, Florence took off as a major peninsular power in the course of the late thirteenth century. By the 1290s, the circumnavigation of the Iberian Peninsula meant that raw wool in large quantities could be brought directly from England to Mediterranean ports by ship, thus avoiding the slow overland journey through France, and Florence's *Arte della Lana*, the wool guild, had started its ascent to becoming the principal producer of woolen cloth in Europe. Locked in rivalry before 1300 with bankers of cities like Siena and Piacenza, Florentines would come early in the fourteenth century to dominate international financial markets as well.

Because of its size and expanding economy, Florence had a relatively high degree of social mobility. The city's prosperity acted like a magnet over a wide area, drawing to it not only the poor in search of jobs but prosperous provincials seeking to increase profits earned in agriculture through entrepreneurial activities. Expecting to play an active role in city life as they had done in their places of origin, prosperous provincial immigrants created a counterforce to oligarchical tendencies.[2] The steady pressure of newly rich men, originally from outlying Tuscan towns, constituted a major ingredient in a political life perhaps unrivaled for its accessibility even among other Tuscan communes.

The death of Emperor Frederick II in 1250 occasioned the fall of

---

[1] Florence roughly equaled the population of Venice, which Frederic C. Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic* (Baltimore, 1973), 18, estimates to have been about 120,000 in 1300. For the population of Paris, see T. Chandler and G. Fox, *3000 Years of Urban Growth* (New York, 1974), 118, which gives the population of that city in 1328 as 274,000.

[2] Enrico Fiumi, "Fioritura e decadenza dell'economia fiorentina," *Archivio storico italiano* 116 (1958): 497–510.

the government dominated by the city's Ghibelline nobility, which he had supported. A successful popular revolt ushered in a broadly based regime known as the *primo popolo*. Although it lasted only a decade and was followed by seven years of narrow Ghibelline rule, at least after 1282 the assumption of power by the guilds encouraged wide participation in politics. The democratic tendency should not be exaggerated: the active political class was largely made up of those who belonged to what would be clearly defined by 1300 as the major guilds, which included as members many of the old Guelf nobility.[3]

Especially in literature, the city's cultural activity after 1250 matched the vitality of political life. Although contemporary Florentines had been subjected to influences from French and Provençal literature as had the rest of the peninsula, Florence, in contrast to areas like the Veneto, demonstrated a strong inclination to appropriate what northern culture offered and redeploy it in works written in the local vernacular. Florentines felt strongly attracted as well to the Sicilian poetry of the imperial court, but that inspiration largely found expression in poems composed in their own language.

What has been said of the vigor of Florentine political, economic, and cultural life could also be said in varying degrees of the other major cities of Tuscany. Here as nowhere else in Italy communal government based on a relatively large political class thrived, and the exigencies of public life placed a premium on oral eloquence. A passion for political activity also characterized hundreds of independent small towns and rural communes prospering in the lands between the borders of the larger powers.[4] Tuscan political societies of all sizes had frequent contact with one another, even if often of a hostile nature; ideas and men circulated easily throughout the area. Cities of coastal Tuscany like Pisa tended to be attracted into the orbit of northern Italian culture and manifested less loyalty to the Tuscan vernacular, but as one moved further east in the province, allegiance

[3] N. Ottokar, *Studi comunali e fiorentini* (Florence, 1948), 78–79. See also his *Il comune di Firenze alla fine del Duecento* (Florence, 1926), 47–122. John Najemy, *Corporatism and Consensus in Florentine Electoral Politics, 1280–1400* (Chapel Hill, 1982), 17–42, analyzes the early elections to the priorate. For a pioneering summary of the evolution of communal government in thirteenth-century Florence, see Daniela da Rosa, *Alle origini della Repubblica fiorentina: Dai consoli al "Primo Popolo" (1172–1260)* (Florence, 1995).

[4] See Witt, *Hercules*, 27–28, for bibliography.

to the Tuscan vernacular grew stronger.[5] The evolution of Florence toward the cultural preeminence it enjoyed in Italy after 1400 began in the second half of the thirteenth century, as the city increasingly tapped the large reservoir of talent available in Tuscany.

1

By the mid-thirteenth century, the native Italian poetic movement coming from the southern part of the peninsula was exercising an enormous influence on Tuscans. Adherents to the movement at the cosmopolitan and often itinerant imperial court included a number of Tuscans, who wrote derivative poetry in a language heavily larded with French and Provençal as well as traces of Sicilian and their local Tuscan dialects.[6] But almost from the beginning of the diffusion of Sicilian influence in Tuscany itself, free of the imperial court, a Sicilian–Tuscan movement got underway that borrowed creatively from southern curial poetry for meters, structure, and content.[7]

Whereas the court poets focused almost solely on the aristocratic theme of love, the writers of the Tuscan communes expanded the thematic scope of lyric to include subjects of interest to their rapidly developing urban culture. Driven by new ethical, religious, and political concerns, eager to express their patriotism and to trumpet the victories of their cities, the Tuscans turned to Provençal sources, where they found poetry in abundance on such themes. In some cases, in the poetry of Lanfranchi da Pistoia or Dante da Maiano, for example, the contact with the troubadours was so impelling that it

[5] Pisa was the place in Tuscany where the use of the written vernacular first expanded in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: Ignazio Baldelli, "La letteratura volgare in Toscana dalle origini ai primi decenni del secolo XIII," in *LI* 7.1:65. For French composition in Pisa, see ibid., 73. For the Provençal of Terramagnino da Pisa, see the bibliography in C. Bologna, "La letteratura dell'Italia settentrionale nel Duecento, in *LI* 7.1:136, n. 7.

[6] Giorgio Petrocchi, "La Toscana nel Duecento," in *LI* 7.1:189–190, discusses the Tuscans involved in the Sicilian movement in the early years 1240–60. Cf. Gianfranco Folena, "Cultura politica dei primi fiorentini," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 147 (1970): 4–5.

[7] Corrado Bologna, "Tradizione testuale e fortuna dei classici," in *LI* 7:493–518; and Antonio E. Quaglio, "I poeti siculo-toscano," *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 1, ed. E. Pasquini and A.E. Quaglio, vol. 1.1 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi* (Bari, 1970), 243–47.

led to direct translation of models and to composition in Provençal itself.[8] Generally, though, the mix of Sicilian and Provençal elements creatively combined to produce in Tuscany a rich variety of Tuscan poetry localized by traces of municipal dialects.[9]

Because of the number of poets and the range of their production, one can begin to identify a society of letters in Florence from roughly 1260.[10] Able to claim neither of the two greatest poets of the Sicilian–Tuscan movement, Bonagiunta of Lucca (ca. 1220–129_?) and Guittone d'Arezzo (1230–93), Florence nonetheless abounded in writers of canzoni and sonnets like Pietro Morovelli, Megliore degli Abati, Neri de' Visdomini, Monte Andrea, Bondie Dietaiuti, Chiaro Davanzati, and Dante da Maiano.[11] On a somewhat different note, Rustico Filippo, to whom Latini dedicated his didactic poem, *Favolello*, displayed a facility for composing burlesque poetry inspired by the goliardic and minstrel traditions along with Guittonian courtly poetry.[12] Compiuta Donzella of Florence, whose few surviving sonnets seem to have been directly inspired by Sicilian models, was the first Tuscan woman poet.[13]

Even before the generation of the poets of the *dolce stil nuovo*, Florence, both by the number of writers it possessed and the variety of compositions that they wrote, had a place among the leading literary centers of Tuscany. With the advent of the new style derived from Bologna, Florence's ascendancy was assured. Inspired by the Bolognese Guido Guinizelli, who died in 1276, Florentine poets, Lapo Gianni, Dino Frescobaldi, Gianni degli Alfani, and particularly Guido Cavalcanti, Dante d'Alighieri, and Cino da Pistoia, returned the Italian lyric to its earlier emphasis on themes of love.[14] So rapid was the pace of creativity among the Florentines, that already in the

[8] On Paolo Lanfranchi da Pistoia and Dante da Maiano, see the comments of Gianfranco Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 2 vols. (Milan and Naples, 1960), 1:353 and 477–78. See also Bologna, "Tradizione testuale," 470–71.

[9] Petrocchi, "La Toscana nel Duecento," 192–98.

[10] Folena, "Cultura poetica," 7.

[11] Quaglio, "I poeti siculo-toscano," 248–49.

[12] Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 2:353–54; and Quaglio, "La poesia realistica," in *Il Duecento delle origini a Dante*, vol. 2, ed. N. Mineo, E. Pasquini and A.E. Quaglio, vol. 1.2 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi* (Bari, 1970), 190.

[13] Petrocchi, "La Toscana nel Duecento," 194 and 197; and Contini, *Il Duecento*, 1:433.

[14] On Guinizzelli, see Petrocchi, "La Toscana nel Duecento," 203–08. See selections by Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 2:447–85; and discussion of Quaglio, "Gli stilnovisti," in *Il Duecento*, 1.1:339–478.

Vita nuova in 1294 Dante was pointing in new poetic directions in exalting the moral and religious authority of the dead Beatrice.

Although much of the early prose written by Florentines consisted of translations from French or Latin or was heavily dependent on contemporary models of French origin, the city's writers demonstrated considerable originality. The *Tresor* of Brunetto Latini was written in French between 1262 and 1266.[15] In fact, the earliest monument of French prose, the *Tresor*, drew much of its inspiration from the French medieval encyclopedic tradition. On his way home to Florence after serving on a Florentine mission to Castille, having heard news of the Ghibelline takeover of Florence after the battle of Montaperti, Latini decided to go into exile in France, where he had many Florentine friends. During the next six years of imposed leisure, most of them apparently spent in Paris, then the leading center of scholastic learning in western Europe, Latini devoted himself to study and writing.

In Paris, Latini came into contact, probably for the first time, with the encyclopedic tradition of medieval France and the schematizing tendencies of the local university world. Those currents made him eager to undertake an ambitious project that could provide a suitable framework for expressing his political and ethical views.[16] Fluent in French by 1262, he decided to write his own encyclopedic work in French for two reasons: "one that we are in France; the other because the language is the most delightful and most widely known of all languages."[17] The *biaus dous amis* (handsome, gentle friend) to whom the *Tresor* was dedicated might have been a Florentine protector or lover of his in Paris (the name of Davizzo della Tosa has been proposed), but the dedicatee could also have been French.[18]

The character of Latini's writings in France suggests that he had not given up hope of eventually returning to Florence. Despite the choice of language, the *Tresor* was decidedly directed to an Italian

[15] The standard biography of Latini is Bianca Ceva's *Brunetto Latini: L'uomo e l'opera* (Milan and Naples, 1965). On the dating of the *Tresor* and the other works of Latini in France, see p. 64. The *Tresor* is edited by Francis J. Carmody, *Li livres dou tresor* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948).

[16] Aristide Marigo, "Cultura letteraria e preumanistica nelle maggiori enciclopedie del '200," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 68 (1916): 1–42 and 289–326, connects Latini with the encyclopedic tradition represented by Vincent of Beauvais. See the caveat by Ceva, *Brunetto Latini*, 196–203.

[17] *Li livres dou tresor*, 18.

[18] Ibid., xvii–xviii.

audience. The urban and communal orientation of the substantial political portion of the *Tresor* would have exercised little appeal for a French reader. That Latini used Tuscan for his other works composed in France reinforces the impression that during his six years of exile he never seriously entertained thoughts of permanent residence there.[19]

Besides a series of important translations, Latini's younger contemporary and fellow notary, Giambono da Bono, authored two works, both moralistic. The first, *Il trattato di virtù*, consisted of a straightforward exposition of the four virtues and seven vices, in the form of an interchange between Philosophy and a disciple. The second, entitled *Il libro de' vizii e delle virtudi*, a reworking of *Il trattato*, represented in dramatic form the battle between vices and virtues for possession of the human soul.[20] In the wake of their victory over evil, the virtues in *Il libro* planned to build "a beautiful temple and a large hospital on the place where the battle was fought," a move that suggests both Giambono's piety and his civic-mindedness.[21]

As in other cities of Tuscany, intense patriotic sentiment in Florence generated a precocious interest in civic history. Although the authenticity of the so-called Malaspina *Istoria fiorentina* is again in doubt, the *Gesta Florentinorum*, a chronicle covering the years 1080 to about 1270, offers one of the earliest examples in Italy of a vernacular historical work.[22] Surviving in different versions in a number of manuscripts, the *Gesta* was perhaps originally written in Latin, and soon translated thereafter.[23] A second chronicle, the *Cronica fiorentina*, covers the years 1181 to 1303 with a long gap between 1249 and

[19] These works in Tuscan include his translation of *De inventione* (*La rettorica*) with commentary; the *Tesoretto*, also uncompleted; translations of three orations of Cicero; and several short poetic works.

[20] G.B. Squarotti, F. Bruni, and U. Dotti, *Dalle origini al Trecento*, Storia della civiltà letteraria italiana, vol. 1.1 (Turin, 1990), 354.

[21] Ibid., 356.

[22] *Enciclopedia dantesca*, ed. Umberto Bosco, 2nd ed., 5 vols. and append. (Rome, 1984), s.v. "Malispini, Ricordano," summarizes the scholarship. The *Cronica* is published by Alfredo Schiaffini, *Testi fiorentini del Dugento e dei primi del Trecento*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1954), 82–150.

[23] C. Segre and M. Marti, *La prosa del Duecento* (Milan and Naples, 1959), 927–29. On the controversy over the *Istoria fiorentina*, see ibid., 947–51. The authors of the *Prosa* in 1959 appear to accept the authenticity of the chronicle, which traces Florentine history down to 1286. Charles T. Davis, however, "The Malaspini Question," in his *Dante's Florence and Other Essays* (Philadelphia, 1984), 94–136, provides compelling arguments for considering it a falsification.

1285.[24] These two works initiated a rich tradition of Florentine historical writing, which in the first half of the fourteenth century included works by Dino Compagni and Giovanni Villani.

A number of prose narratives, works like the *Conti di antichi cavalieri* and *Fiori e vita di filosafi e d'altri savi e d'imperadori*, are attributed to late-thirteenth-century Tuscany, but their precise provenance cannot be determined.[25] The most important fictional narrative of the century in an Italian vernacular, however, appears to have been written by a Florentine shortly after 1280.[26] A collection of over a hundred brief tales, the *Novellino* relied on a wide variety of sources, mostly French in origin, and in turn became a source for later narratives, the most famous of which was the *Decameron*.

Florentine vernacular readers in the late thirteenth century had access, moreover, to other original vernacular prose works produced elsewhere in Tuscany. The university city of Arezzo furnished a number of scientific texts like the *Questioni filosofiche e naturali*, which discussed the theses of Adelard of Bath, and the *Composizione del mondo colle sue cascioni* of Restoro d'Arezzo, a compendious treatise on astronomy, astrology, and physics.[27] Some of the philosophical and scientific literature available in the vernacular in the late thirteenth century came in the form of translations, such as the Tuscan version of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* by Taddeo Alderotti (1210–95), based on Herman the German's Latin translation (1243 or 1244).[28]

Nowhere is the attitude of Florentines toward language more revealing than in their approach to translation. In dealing with French, a language so similar in structure to the Tuscan vernaculars, the translator was usually able to produce his version without much need to analyze the lexical or syntactical elements of the original. He primarily wanted to communicate the original's contents, and one

[24] Segre and Marti, *La prosa del Duecento*, 907–08, discuss the work and provide bibliography.

[25] Squarotti, *Dalle origini al Trecento*, 371–72.

[26] Ibid., 793–95.

[27] On the manuscript of the *Questioni filosofiche*, see *Mostra di codici romanzi delle biblioteche fiorentine* (Florence, 1957), 102–04. The most recent edition of *Composizione del mondo colle sue cascione* is by A. Morino (Florence, 1976).

[28] For historiographical discussion of Alderotti's work, see Nancy G. Siraisi, *Taddeo Alderotti and His Pupils: Two Generations of Italian Medical Learning* (Princeton, 1981), 77–81. Cf. Bodo Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," in *Die italienische Literatur im Zeitalter Dantes und am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Renaissance*, ed. August Buck, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1987), 2:334–35.

might consider the result more a reworking of the original than a translation.[29] The late-thirteenth-century Tuscan translation of a French prose abridgment of Benedict de Sainte-Maure's *Le roman de Troie*, while elegant and lively, reflects no greater concern for faithfully rendering the text in Tuscan than does the crude midcentury Roman version of the French *Li fait des Romains* in Roman dialect.[30]

Similarly, when dealing with recent Latin works where the syntax came close to the vernacular, Tuscans showed little hesitation in manipulating the text according to what they considered the needs of their audience. Although Andrea da Grosseto at Paris in 1268 and Soffredi del Grazia of Pistoia at Provins in 1275 translated a number of Albertano da Brescia's moral writings, probably for the benefit of Tuscan merchants living in France, the translations also had a wide circulation in Tuscany.[31] In both, the emphasis on the didactic character of the text dictated the manner of translation. In the rendering of Albertano's frequent quotations from ancient writers, only "traces" of classical prolepsis and figurative language survive.[32] As I will show, this free approach to translating medieval Latin texts contrasted with the special reverence shown by the first Tuscan translators of pagan authors.

Faithfulness to the ancient original was not characteristic of French translations or French adaptations of ancient Latin texts, which began to appear in central France in the late twelfth century. Overwhelmingly translations of poetry, among the earliest were *Piramus*, *Philomena*, and *Narcisse*, reworkings in French of portions of the *Metamorphoses* according to the current rules of *ars poetrie*. The already-mentioned *Li fait des Romains* (1213–14), a compilation draw-

[29] Segre, "I volgarizzamenti del Due e Trecento," in his *Lingua, stile e società: Studi sulla storia della prosa italiana* (Milan, 1963), 58–59, and for general observations on the translations from French, Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 232–33.

[30] On the *Istorietta troiana* see Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 335. For *Li fait des Romains* see L.F. Flutre, *Li Fait des Romains dans les littératures française et italienne du XIIIe au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1933, rpt. Geneva, 1974), 192–256; and Cesare Segre, *Volgarizzamenti del Due e Trecento* (Turin, 1969), 87–89. See also Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 337.

[31] For these translations, see Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 334–35. For an anonymous Tuscan translation of Albertano's works (1272 or 1274), see ibid., 333. For the diffusion of Albertano's work, see James M. Power, *Albertanus of Brescia: The Pursuit of Happiness in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1992), 121–27.

[32] Segre, "I volgarizzamenti," 63. On Soffredi's translation, see especially G. Zaccagnini, "Soffredi del Grazia e il suo volgarizzamento dei trattati morali d'Albertano da Brescia," *Bullettino storico pistoiese* 18 (1916): 114–22.

ing on Caesar, Lucan, Sallust, and Suetonius, was one of the earliest prose translations: but the translation was free enough that the result was essentially a new work.[33] The five French translations of Ovid's *Ars amatoria* made between the first half of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth illustrate well the character of the French approach. Four were free poetic translations and the fifth was a prose compilation that followed Ovid's original in its content.[34]

While prizing the material of the ancient writings, French translators treated their ancient originals with a liberty that usually made the translations very different works.[35] In addition, because in the course of the thirteenth century the *langue d'oïl* had produced a rich literature affording a large measure of stability to the syntax and lexicography of the language, French translators tended to adjust or rework the Latin original to fit the demands of their own language.[36] Consequently, French versions largely dehistoricized the pagan originals, nullifying their potential for creating cultural or intellectual disruption.

From their earliest translations of classical writers, the Tuscans exhibited a very different attitude toward ancient texts. The first Florentine translators, Latini and Giambono di Bono, were interested in rhetoric and politics, leading them to chose Latin prose rather than poetry for translation.[37] Their choice of prose also reflected the tradition of *ars dictaminis*, which in the thirteenth century was generally dominated by Emilia and Tuscany. Bologna was the greatest teaching center of the art, but Florence had contributed two of the three most creative *dictatores* of the Bolognese *studio* in the first half of the thirteenth century, Bene of Florence and Boncompagno.

At Bologna not one of the two Florentines but a third *dictator* of

[33] Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 240–41, with bibliography.

[34] Ibid., 240.

[35] Notable exceptions are several works translated into French outside of France. The *De inventione* of Cicero was translated by John of Antioch, who may have been Italian, in 1282; Seneca's correspondence (ca. 1308) and Livy's First Decade (ca. 1300) were both translated in southern Italy, again possibly by Italians: J. Monfrin, "Humanisme et traductions au Moyen Age: Les traducteurs et leur public en France au Moyen Age," in *L'Humanisme médiéval dans les littératures romanes du XIIe au XIVe siècle*, ed. A. Fourrier (Paris, 1964), 217–62.

[36] Segre illustrates this well in his study of Jean de Meun's translation of Vegetius: "Jean de Meun e Bono Giamboni, traduttori di Vegetio (Saggio sui volgarizzamenti in Francia e in Italia)," in his *Lingua, stile e società*, 271–300.

[37] Segre, *I volgarizzamenti*, 59–60.

Bolognese origin, Guido Faba, was the first to introduce the vernacular into his teaching. Through his *Gemma purpurea*, *Arenghe*, and *Parlamenti e epistole*, short treatises written in the 1240s, Guido provided the first examples of *ars arengandi*, the art of composing speeches, in the vernacular. Another Bolognese in the next generation, Matteo dei Libri, continued Faba's work with his *Arringhe*.[38] The earliest identified vernacular *ars dictaminis*, however, brings us back to Florence, if, as is probable, Latini authored *Sommetta ad amaestramento di componere volgarmente lettere*.[39]

Obviously concerned with making vernacular prose composition more sophisticated, Bolognese and Florentine *dictatores* also produced translations of the two most revered manuals of composition from the ancient world. Between 1258 and 1266, fra Guidotto of Bologna made a translation of the pseudo-Ciceronian *Ad Herennium* entitled *Fiore di rettorica*, while between 1260 and 1262, Latini, in his *Rettorica*, translated a portion of Cicero's *De inventione* with commentary. That the earliest manuscript of Guidotto's translation, nearly contemporary with its composition, is found in Tuscan indicates a good deal about the market for such a work. While a second version exists in Bolognese, a third, still from the thirteenth century, and falsely considered a revision produced by Bono Giambono of Florence, was again in Tuscan.[40]

Latini had undertaken his never-to-be-completed translation of the *De inventione* in Paris, and after his return to Tuscany in 1267 he also translated three of Cicero's orations as models of eloquence for his contemporaries. These translations may have inspired a Tuscan contemporary of Latini, who remains unidentified, to translate the first

[38] Faba's vernacular work appears in *Arenge con uno studio sull'eloquenza d'arte civile e politica duecentesca*, ed. G. Vecchi (Bologna, 1954); and *Parlementi e Epistole*, ed. A. Gaudenzi, in his *I suoni, le forme e le parole dell'odierno dialetto della città di Bologna* (Bologna, 1889), 127–60. The work of Matteo has been published by E. Vincenti in the series Documenti di filologia, no. 17 (Milan and Naples, 1974).

[39] Helene Wieruszowski, "Brunetto Latini als Lehrer Dantes und der Florentiner," in her *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy*, Storia e letteratura, no. 121 (Rome, 1971), 547–49. She publishes the treatise on 551–61. On Latini's *dictamen* style, see my *Salutati and His Letters*, 35–36.

[40] Cesare Segre, "I volgarizzamenti," 52–53; and Antonio Quaglio, "Rhetorica, prosa e narrativa del Duecento," in *Il Duecento*, 1.2:278–81, and bibliography, 411. Fra Guidotto of Bologna was called to teach *ars arengandi* and *ars dictaminis* at Siena in 1278: Wieruszowski, "Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century," in her *Politics and Culture*, 417, n. 3, and idem, "Rhetoric and the Classics in Italian Education of the Thirteenth Century," in her *Politics and Culture*, 619.

of Cicero's Catiline orations.[41] In contrast, the appearance of a collection of vernacular public speeches for various official occasions, composed by a Florentine notary, ser Filippo Ceffi, around 1300, reflected the medieval Bolognese rhetorical tradition in that it drew heavily on the *Arringhe* of Matteo dei Libri.[42]

Preceding Latini's translations by several years, fra Guidotto's *Fiore di rettorica* was no masterpiece. Guidotto's admission in the first chapter that "the material is very subtle and not well understood by me" does not reassure readers.[43] His historical sketch of the background for *Ad Herennium* also betrays his weak sense of the Roman past. He probably drew on some unidentified French compilation of Roman history for his description of the "knightly" Cicero:

> I want you to know that he was an active man, well-liked and full of grace and virtue. Large-proportioned and well-made in every part, he was a knight marvelous with arms, fearlessly courageous, endowed with great wisdom, learned and discreet, discoverer of many things.[44]

The translator's tendency to use frequent paraphrases in rendering the author's words necessarily diminished the ancient presence in the translation, as did Guidotto's substitution of contemporary terms for ancient ones (*podestà* for *judices*; *San Giovanni Laterano* for *templum Jovis*).

In contrast, Latini's translation of the Latin text, despite occasional anachronisms, reflects a new conception of conformity to the original. Latini's *Rettorica* was intended to be a Tuscan translation of Cicero's *De inventione* with extended commentary. Because his goal was didactic, he strove for clarity and organization both in his translations of passages from Cicero and in his own comments. Given the expository character of the Ciceronian original, the contrast between

---

[41] Latini's translations of the three orations are found in *Le tre orazioni di M.T. Cicerone dette dinanzi a Cesare per M. Marcello, Q. Ligario e il re Deiotaro volgarizzate da B. Latini*, ed. M. Rezzi (Milan, 1832). Francesco Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamenti dai classici latini* (Florence, 1952), 31, concludes that the attribution of the Catiline oration to Latini "è certamente possible, e anche probabile."

[42] M. Palma, "Ceffi, Filippo," *DBI* 23 (Rome, 1979), 320–321.

[43] Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamenti*, 7–8. Maggini, 8–9, provides examples of Guidotto's mistakes and (6–7) describes Guidotto's reworking of the text at a number of points. On the manuscript tradition, see G. B. Speroni, "Sulla tradizione manoscritta del *Fiore di retorica*," *Studi di filologia italiana* 28 (1970): 5–53.

[44] Cited from Maggini, 5: "Voglio che sappiate che fu uomo intento de la sua vita, amabile e costante di grazia e de vertù, grande della persona e ben fatto de tutte membra, e fue d'arme maraviglioso cavaliere, franco del coraggio, armato de gran senno, fornito di scienze e di discrezione, ritrovatore de tutte cose."

the styles of Latini's commentary and his translations is barely noticeable. Latini was deeply schooled in traditional *ars dictaminis*, whose manuals often gave groups of clauses and syncategorematic terms for organizing a composition and moving between its parts. He used this training both in his translation and in his commentary to underline the structural character of the text by rendering the original with hypothetical (*si*), concessive (*avegna che*), adversative (*tuttavia*), and deductive (*dunque*) conjunctions, and with frequent correlatives (*quante ... altrettante*, *quando ... allora*). On the whole, Latini's translation remained faithful to the meaning of the original without doing violence to vernacular syntax. His use of the subjunctive and his word order, for example, followed contemporary Tuscan usage.[45]

The literary character of Cicero's orations provided greater scope for Latini's talents. In his translations of *Pro Ligario*, *Pro Marcello*, and *Pro Deiotaro*, the didactic purpose was more easily balanced with artistic considerations than in the *Rettorica*. Sensing greater freedom, Latini embodied the form of the Latin period more successfully in these translations than in his earlier work. At the same time, Latini satisfied his medieval penchant for amplification by frequent use of hendiadys, e.g., *ferocitas* (fierceness): *l'asprezza e la crudeltà* (harshness and cruelty); *dux* (leader): *guidatore e governatore* (leader and governor); *calamitosus* (disastrous): *misero e misavventurato* (miserable and unfortunate). Occasionally his ear for the *cursus* produced a rearrangement of Cicero's word order.[46] The latter tendency, however, only reinforced the oratorical character of the speeches, which, unknown to Latini, had their own metric rules.

Thus, Latini's translations of Cicero were innovative not only for the reason that he did them at all, but because, together with preserving the content, he tried to render the formal character of Cicero's prose. He incited his younger colleagues by his example, so that by about 1360 many ancient works of prose and poetry in circulation had been rendered into the Tuscan vernacular. By then, his approach to translation had become characteristic of the Tuscan school.

Bono Giambono, Latini's younger contemporary, represented a more popular taste in his selection of texts for translation. Besides his

[45] Segre, "La sintassi del periodo nei primi prosatori italiani," in *Lingua, stile e società*, 190–95.

[46] Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamenti*, 24–25.

rendition of Innocent III's *De miseria humane conditionis*, his translations of Latin works included the late ancient *Historie adversus paganos* of Orosius and the *Epitome rei militaris* of Flavius Vegetius, the *Historie* done at the request of a Florentine patrician, Lamberto degli Abati, and the *Epitome* commissioned by another, Manetto della Scala.[47]

In rendering the *Historie* and the *Epitome*, Bono demonstrated a degree of respect akin to piety. Drawing on linguistic patterns from the originals and adapting them with skill in his translations, he successfully conveyed in his own periods the sinuosities of form and thought found in the Latin. In his task he was obviously aided by certain linguistic usages congenial to Tuscan, such as proleptic construction, the past participle as an ablative absolute or gerund, and the infinitive as a noun.[48]

Admittedly, Bono's omission of Orosius's long apology for Christianity, which Bono no longer felt to be relevant, demonstrates that the ancient text was not so sacred as to be exempt from manipulation. Nevertheless, Bono's treatment of Innocent's medieval text was far more arbitrary. Not only did Bono omit whole sections of the work, but he amplified others, substituting moral reflections for some of Innocent's extreme condemnations of the world. The result was to transform an ascetic's praise of a solitary life of renunciation into a reflection "on the destiny that awaits the active man of the Florentine commune."[49]

2

The series of magisterial Tuscan translations of ancient Latin authors by Florentines, which began with Latini in the 1260s and reached its apex in the translations of Livy in the 1340s, chronicles the evolution of Tuscan from a dialect to a literary language for prose. Tuscan had already attained the status of a literary language for poetry in Florence by 1300. While in Latini and his younger contemporary, Bono di Giambono, interest in translation was impelled largely by didactic

[47] The bibliography on these two translations is found in Guthmüller, "Volgarizzamenti," 342 and 346. For the dedicatees, see 211. The Tuscan translation of the *Tresor* is no longer attributed to Giambono (230).

[48] These usages are illustrated by Segre, "Jean de Meun e Bono Giamboni," 292–94 and 296–97.

[49] Quaglio, "Retorica, prosa e narrativa del Duecento," in *Il Duecento*, 2.1:403.

concerns, artistic considerations came to play an increasing role for their successors. Tuscan was already a language congenial to Latin constructions; in the hands of translators guided by Latin prose models, it became endowed with a solid, complex syntax and a rich, multivalent vocabulary, capable of rendering ancient Latin authors elegantly.

No Italian before Petrarch extolled the importance of studying antiquity as a guide to life more clearly than did Bartolomeo da San Concordio. Bartolomeo was a Dominican friar of Pisan origin who lived in Florence between 1297 and 1304.[50] Like Latini, he privileged the best Latin prose; he translated Sallust's *Catilinae coniuratio* and *Bellum Iugurthinum* around 1302, at the request of Neri Cambi, one of the most powerful men in Florence.[51] For Bartolomeo, the aesthetic quality (*diletto*) of the translation became an explicit concern, while he seems to have believed that the didactic value of reading the ancients derived not from a disconnected series of lessons that they might teach but from "the great virtue that the memory of history has in itself," that is, from the general value of antiquity as an ethical model for the present.[52] The first to go beyond simply asserting the difficulty of the translator's task, Bartolomeo seriously reflected on the problems of the enterprise. The enormousness of the task, he wrote in the preface to the translations, derived from

> the weightiness of the book and the fact that the words and the vernacular form do not correspond in every way to Latin. Indeed, often it is fitting to put several words in the vernacular for one word in Latin. And even then, they will not be really exact. Also, sometimes it is appropriate to depart somewhat from the words, in order to express the thought and to be able to speak more clearly and without subtlety.[53]

---

[50] C. Segre, "Bartolomeo da San Concordio (Bartolomeo Pisano)," *DBI* 6 (Rome, 1964), 768–70. A theologian, Bartolomeo composed commentaries on Virgil and on Seneca's tragedies, now lost. Bartolomeo's *Ammaestramenti degli antichi, latini e Toscani: Raccolti e volgarizzati per fra Bartolomeo da San Concordio*, ed. V. Nannucci (Florence, 1841), was his translation of his *Documenta antiquorum*, which he had written in Latin. The translation was commissioned by a powerful Florentine, Geri Spini (Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamenti*, 25). For his translation of Sallust, see the next note.

[51] The Sallust translations were published a number of times in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I used *Il Catilinario e il Giugurtinio di C. Crispo Sallustio, volgarizzati per frate Bartolomeo da S. Concordio* (Parma, 1860).

[52] He writes "della grande virtù che ha in se la memoria della storia" (ibid., 1).

[53] Cited from Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamenti*, 44: "... per la gravezza del libro e perché le parole e 'l modo volgare non rispondeno in tutto a la lettera. Anzi conviene spesse fiate d'una parola per lettera dirne più in volgare, e non saranno però così

By these observations, Bartolomeo manifested both his conception of translation as an art and his awareness that two different languages were involved, each with its integrity of structure and vocabulary.

Solicitous to make the texts available to "vernacular men," Bartolomeo included throughout his version glosses on names and institutions for which Tuscan had no counterpart. The explanation for some of his translations, however, is not obvious. When, for example, at *Catil.* 1.2, he wrote: "With the gods, which means with God and the angels" or at 35.2: "I swear to you by Medius Fidius, that is by God," was he trying to render the pagan text less objectionable to his readers? When at 19.1 he wrote: "*Quaestor*, that is receiver and dispenser of the property of the commune," was he consciously compromising historical accuracy to facilitate comprehension?[54]

In any case, Bartolomeo generally succeeded in capturing in Tuscan the *brevitas* and solemnity of Sallust's prose. A few lines of his translation of Sallust's comparison of Caesar with Cato illustrate his ability to articulate the compressed energy of the original. On the left is the original, and on the right is Bartolomeo's translation:

Igitur eis genus, aetas, eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii. Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur	Questi due gentilezza, tempo, bel parlare ebbero quasi egualmente, et anche grandezza d'animo e gloriosa fama; ma per altro modo l'uno e l'altro. Cesare fu avuto e tenuto grande per dare benefici e grandi guiderdoni ....[55]

Far better than Latini with Cicero, Bartolomeo grasped the distinctive character of Sallust's style, conveying it in his own language, and in the process, with Latin as a model, he further enhanced the capacity of Tuscan to express complex thought and nuanced emotion. Only a few years later, in the *Convivio*, Dante would claim that through the vernacular commentary on his own poetry, "lofty and

propie; anche a le fiate si conviene uscire alquanto dele parole per isponere la sentenzia e per potere parlare più chiaro et aperto."

[54] Ibid., 45.

[55] Ibid., 46–47, cites Bartolomeo's translation of *Catil.* 54, to show how closely he follows the Latin. The English translation of Bartolomeo's version reads: "These two men were almost equal in birth, age, and eloquence, as well as in magnanimity and glorious reputation, but each in his own way. Caesar was considered and held to be great because he gave benefits and rewards ...." We should note Bartolomeo's use of hendiadys, i.e., "fu avuto e tenuto" for the Latin "habebatur."

new conceptions are expressed appropriately, sufficiently, and eloquently, as if in Latin itself."[56]

Alberto della Piagentina's Tuscan translation (1332) of Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*, the most influential philosophical work of late Roman antiquity, provides indisputable evidence of the vernacular's evolution. Writing his work in a Venetian prison, where he presumably died ca. 1333, this Florentine, drawing on Cassiodorus and the ninth-century chronicler Freculf, demonstrates, like Latini and Bartolomeo, an acute sense of the historical circumstances surrounding the composition of the original text.

The Boethian text posed exceptional problems for the translator. It dealt with complex philosophical ideas expressed in a specialized vocabulary, often structured in *prosimetron*, that is, in prose passages alternating with poetry. Not only did Alberto understand Boethius's meaning, but he developed a corresponding Tuscan philosophical vocabulary, heavily Latinized. For his syntax, he turned to the involved model worked out by Dante in the *Convivio*. Alberto's philosophical sophistication was at its best in his rendering of Boethius's poetic passages in terza rima.[57]

The translations of Valerius Maximus's *Facta et dicta memorabilia* and of Livy, made in the 1330s and 1340s and sometimes attributed to Boccaccio, mark the highest achievement of the art before the late fifteenth century.[58] It is generally agreed that whoever translated Livy used the Latin edition recently established by Petrarch on the basis of conjecture and collation. Two slightly different versions of the Livy

[56] *Convivio*, I.10.12, ed. Busnelli and Vandelli, 2 vols. (Florence, 1934), 1:65: "Sì com'è per esso altissimi e novissimi concetti convenevolemente, sufficientemente e acconciamente, quasi come per esso latino, manifestare."

[57] Alberto's work is published by S. Battaglia in *Il Boezio e l'Arrighetto nelle versioni del Trecento* (Turin, 1929). For Alberto's historical sense, see his *Prolago*, 3–11. Cf. ibid., ix–x. A second contemporary translation of the same work, this one in verse, was done in Siena by Grazia di Meo di messer Grazia, canon of the church of Sant'Andrea delle Serre, who was commissioned by Niccolò di Gino Guicciardini for the work (Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 336).

[58] M.T. Casella, *Tra Boccaccio e Petrarca: I volgarizzamenti di Tito Livio e di Valerio Massimo* (Padua, 1982), insists on Boccaccio's authorship. See, however, objections of Armando Petrucci, *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 2 (1984): 369–87; and G. Tanturli, "Volgarizzamenti e ricostruzione dell'antico: I casi della terza e quarta deca di Livio e di Valerio Massimo: la parte del Boccaccio (a proposito di un'attribuzione)," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 27 (1986): 811–88. For the printed editions of the texts, see Casella, *Tra Boccaccio e Petrarca*, xi.

translation survive and three of the Latin text of Valerius, together with what appears to have been the beginning of a fourth attempt.[59]

Although the translator of the Fourth Decade confided in his preface that, where Livy became too difficult for his less sophisticated readers, he would expand on Livy's text to make it intelligible, his reverence for the ancient work prevented him from carrying out that intention.[60] Indeed, in both the third and fourth Decades the translator insisted on a faithful translation of the original to the point where he introduced novel Latinisms like *prera alla provincia* [*praeerat*] and *committere la battaglia* [*committere proelium*] in an effort to maintain the properly foreign character of Livy's text in Tuscan.[61] The practice of placing participial constructions and verbs at the end of phrases, if somewhat monotonous, lent sonorous dignity to the translation. In producing vernacular versions of Valerius and Livy in which the Italian reverberated with the Latin originals, the translator or translators invented the means for creating *vetustas* in the vernacular text.

The first half of the fourteenth century witnessed a flurry of other translations (of varying quality) of ancient prose works. Before 1312, with the help of a French translation, Riccardo Petri, a Florentine businessman, prepared a Tuscan version of Seneca's *Ad Lucilum epistulae morales*.[62] Of the two anonymous translations of Palladio's *Agricultura* in circulation by the mid-fourteenth century, the earlier, although based directly on the Latin, was only a loose translation, but the second, perhaps by Andrea Lancia, loyally reflected the original.[63] The first of the two Tuscan translations of Cicero's *De amicitia* belongs to the first half of the fourteenth century, while the second is somewhat later, although still from the fourteenth century. Whereas the first is sensitive to the Ciceronian original and is on the whole an elegant version, the second indulges in frequent paraphrases and seems largely a reworking of its predecessor.[64]

---

[59] Ibid., 12–13.

[60] Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamenti*, 84.

[61] Ibid., 75 and 84. On the Livy translation, see also Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 341.

[62] On Senecan letters, ibid., 345. For the French translation, see M. Eusebi, "La più antica traduzione francese delle *Lettere morali* di Seneca e i suoi derivati," *Romania* 91 (1970): 1–47.

[63] Concetto Marchesi, "Di alcuni volgarizzamenti toscani in codici fiorentini," *Scritti minori di filologia e di letteratura*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1978), 1:414–32, esp. 416, 421–23, and 432.

[64] Ibid., "Le redazioni trecentistiche volgari del *De amicitia* di Cicerone secondo i codici fiorentini," 1:155–72, esp. 156–61.

No one expressed the enthusiasm of early Trecento Florentines for ancient Latin authors better than Giovanni Villani, who, in setting out his motive for deciding to keep a chronicle, explained:

> Finding myself on that blessed pilgrimage in the holy city of Rome (in 1300), I saw the great and ancient things of that place and read the histories and great deeds of the Romans, written by Virgil, Sallust, Lucan, Titus Livy, Valerius, Paul Orosius, and other masters of history who wrote things great and small, of the deeds and achievements of the Romans, and also of foreign peoples in the whole world. In order to preserve the past and provide a model for those who are to follow, I emulated this style and form, just like a disciple, although unworthy of doing such a thing.[65]

It is unlikely that Giovanni had read in Latin the works that he mentions. Otherwise, how to explain why decades later he would request Zanobi da Strada, at the time still a teacher of grammar in the city, to translate the *Somnium Scipionis* for him?[66] He probably read Orosius in Bono's translation, and a version of the popular *Fatti di Cesare* – a translation of *Li fait des Romains* – may have supplied him with what he knew of the four ancient historians whom he mentioned. His source for Virgil remains unknown, unless in his account of his trip to Rome, he was predating his reading of Ciampolo degli Ugurgieri's prose translation of the *Aeneid* (1313–15) or of Andrea Lancia's epitome of the translation, completed by 1316.[67] Before

[65] Giovanni Villani, *Cronica*, ed. F.G. Dragomanni, 4 vols. (Florence, 1844–45), 2:39 (bk. VIII, ch. 36). The passage is also found in *Nuova Cronica*, ed. G. Porta, 3 vols. (Parma, 1990–91), 2:58 (bk. IX, ch. 36).

[66] Paola Guidotti, "Un amico del Petrarca e del Boccaccio: Zanobi da Strada, poeta laureato," *Archivio storico italiano*, 7th ser., 13 (1930): 281. On the basis of different references to classical authors in his chronicle, Ernst Mehl, *Die Weltanschauung des Giovanni Villani: Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte Italiens im Zeitalter Dantes* (Hildesheim, 1973), 17–21, holds that Villani had a relatively good knowledge of Latin literature, but I maintain that his knowledge likely came from translations.

[67] I do not know whether Giulia Valerio's edition of *Il volgarizzamento dell'Eneide di Ciampolo di Meo degli Ugurgieri* has yet been published. The Lancia text exists in several editions: P. Fanfani, "Compilazione della Eneide di Virgilio fatta volgare per ser A.L. notaro fiorentino," *L'Etruria* 1 (1851): 162–85, 221–52, 296–318, 497–508, 625–32 and 745–60. The translation of the abridgment was completed before 1316: Segre, *I volgarizzamenti*, 569. About this same time a popular vernacular reworking of the *Aeneid* was done by fra Guido of Pisa (ibid., 570). See also Guthmüller, "Volgarizzamenti," 214 and 346–47. E.G. Parodi, "I rifacimenti e le traduzioni italiane dell'Eneide di Virgilio prime del Rinascimento," *Studi di filologia romanza* 2 (1887): 97–368, remains the basic analysis of the various manuscripts of the vernacular *Aeneid*.

Giulia Valerio, "La cronologia dei primi volgarizzamenti dell'*Eneide* e la diffusione della *Commedia*," *Medioevo romanzo* 10 (1985): 1–18, argues convincingly that Lancia

Villani's death from plague in 1348, in any case, not only the Virgilian epic, but also Sallust, Valerius, and most of what was known of Livy would have been available to Villani in Tuscan.

Given the difficulty of faithfully expressing the verse of one language in that of another, it is understandable that Tuscan translations of ancient poetry began decades after the first renditions of prose. Even then, translators did not easily attempt a poetic rendition in the vernacular. In fact, with the exception of these translations of passages of metric poetry in Boethius, such renditions did not commonly appear until late in the Quattrocento. Ovid, who together with Virgil was probably the most popular poet of the Middle Ages, received ample attention from local translators. His *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris* were both already translated twice into prose in the first decades of the fourteenth century.[68] At some time between 1320 and 1330, ser Filippo Ceffi prepared a translation of the *Heroides* at the request of a well-to-do Florentine woman, Lisa, wife of Simone dei Peruzzi. The translation of Ovid's masterpiece, the *Metamorphoses*, was the work of ser Arrigo Simintendi da Prato, who, while probably taking Ceffi's work as his model, introduced new expressions and reinforced the use of Latinate participial constructions in the vernacular.[69]

In rendering the entire *Aeneid*, Ciampolo degli Urgurgieri, like Arrigo with the *Metamorphoses*, had to work with consummate skill in order to capture the nuances of the original and its structure. Similarly, the Tuscan translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, in circulation at least by 1361, showed its author to have been a master of both Latin and vernacular. Intent on producing a literary version of the ancient

---

used Ciampolo's translation as the basis for his abridgment and consequently that Ciampolo's work must have been written several years before 1316. She rejects Lancia's claim that his compendium was a vernacular translation of a Latin one by a certain fra Anastasio, a man and a work never identified. Because Ciampolo's translation echoed passages from the *Inferno* and the *Purgatorio*, it would have had to have been written after these *cantiche* were in circulation. According to Giorgio Petrocchi, *Itinerari danteschi*, 87, the circulation of the two *cantiche* only began between 1313 and 1315 (see below, 228, n. 156). Ciampolo's prose version of the *Aeneid* would then belong to the same period.

Lancia's work was commissioned by Coppo di Borghese di Migliorato Domenici.

[68] There were four translations of each in the fourteenth century: Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 342–43. They have all been published in *I volgarizzamenti trecenteschi dell Ars amoris e dei Remedia amoris*, ed. V. Lippi Bigazzi, 2 vols. (Florence, 1987).

[69] Guthmüller, "Die volgarizzamenti," 212, and for bibliography, 343.

text, he translated faithfully, but with a certain freedom of expression designed to capture Lucan's intent.[70]

Although Tuscany was not the only province of Italy where translations of ancient Latin texts appeared in the first half of the Trecento, the contribution of other areas was modest by comparison. In 1323, an Apulian notary, Filippo da Santa Croce, used a French translation (now lost) of the First Decade of Livy's *Ab urbe condita* to prepare his version, while the anonymous French translation used by Riccardo Petri for Seneca's letters, mentioned above, was executed between 1308 and 1310 at the command of a great Italian noble of the *Regno*, Bartolomeo Siginulfo.[71] A few decades later, Accurso da Cremona, in the very years when Boccaccio was working on his translation of Valerius Maximus, composed another in Sicilian dialect (1337–42).[72] As for the Veneto, it apparently contributed only an unidentified version of Boethius that Alberto della Piagentina consulted, while relying for his own translation primarily, on the Latin text.[73] Compared with the production of Tuscany (and more particularly eastern Tuscany, with its center at Florence), other areas of Italy contributed little.

3

The demand for translations of ancient Latin literature in Florence and its immediate neighborhood points to an extraordinarily high degree of vernacular literacy among the population. Perhaps a greater percentage of Florentines read their own language in the fourteenth century than at any other time before the twentieth.[74] In

[70] Ibid., 342.

[71] Ibid., 345.

[72] Ibid., 245.

[73] Segre, *I volgarizzamenti*, 286. Segre indicates translations of Boethius from Pisa and the Veneto prior to Alberto's. At points, Alberto used the Venetian one in his work: G. Bertoni, "Intorno a due volgarizzamenti di Boezio," *Poeti e poesie del medio evo e del rinascimento* (Modena, 1922), 203–12. Of three later Trecento versions of Boethius, one may have been from the Veneto (Segre, *I volgarizzamenti*, 286). In listing Veneto translations, I have not considered Niccolò of Verona's translation of *Pharsalia*, rendered into Franco-Italian in 1343, because it only loosely follows the original (Alberto Limitani, "L'epica in *Lengue de France: L'Entrée d'Espagne* e Niccolò da Verona," *SCV* 2:262–64).

[74] My arguments for the formal teaching of the vernacular in Florentine schools are found in my "What Did Giovannino Read and Write? Literacy in Early Renais-

his *Cronica*, Giovanni Villani provided a brief description of Florentine schools around 1338, along with an estimate of school enrollment:

> We find that there are from eight to ten thousand boys and girls learning to read. Of boys studying *abbaco* and arithmetic, there are from 1000 to 1200 in six schools. And those studying Latin and logic in four large schools number from 550 to 600.[75]

Although the age could vary, children completing the full term of elementary school typically began at about age six and ended about eleven.[76] At that point, parents faced a choice between the abacus or the grammar school. The first course of study lasted approximately two years, while the second lasted four or five.

The first level of education was designed to provide students with training in reading and writing their own language and a rote knowledge of Latin grammar, whose rules, however, the students did not necessarily understand. At the next level, the abacus school focused

---

sance Florence," *I Tatti Studies* 6 (1995): 83–114. The position that all instruction dealt with Latin materials and that reading and writing of the vernacular were learned outside the formal classroom has most recently been sustained by Robert Black. He describes a completely Latin education: "The Curriculum of Italian Elementary and Grammar Schools, 1350–1500," in *The Shapes of Knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. D.R. Kelley and R.H. Popkin, International Archives of the History of Ideas, no. 124 (Dordrecht, 1991), 139–43. See as well Bruno Migliorini, *Storia della lingua italiana* (Florence, 1960), 201–02; Piero Lucchi, "Santacroce, il Salterio e il Babuino: Libri per imparare a leggere nel primo secolo della stampa," *Alfabetismo e cultura scritta*, ed. A. Bartoli-Langelli and Armando Petrucci, *Quaderni storici*, n.s., 38 (1978): 598; and Sylvia Rizzo, "Il latino nell' Umanesimo," *LI* 5:394.

That some study of the vernacular took place in Florentine elementary schools is the position of Paul Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600* (Baltimore and London, 1989), 160 and 276; and Paul Gehl, *A Moral Art: Grammar, Society, and Culture in Trecento Florence* (Ithaca and London, 1993), 34–35. See my summary of the controversy, "What Did Giovannino Read and Write?" 99–101.

[75] Villani, *Cronica*, bk. XI, ch. 94, 3:324; and *Nuova cronica*, bk. XII, ch. 94, 3:198. On the accuracy of Villani's statistics, see my "What Did Giovannino Read and Write?" 88–98.

[76] Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Le chiavi fiorentine di Barbablù: L'apprendimento della lettura a Firenze nel XV secolo," *Bambini*, ed. E. Becchi, *Quaderni storici*, n.s., 57 (1984): 770–72. Three kinds of material are consistently mentioned as the basis for the program of study in the elementary school, the *carta* or *tavola*, the *salterio*, and the *donadello*. The first seems to have been a simple sheet containing the alphabet; the second, a collection of religious verses and moralisms; and the third, a shortened version of Donatus's late-fourth-century Latin grammar (Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy*, 142–61 and 174–88; Gehl, *A Moral Art*, 31–32 and 82–106).

on the acquisition of mathematical and accounting skills, and both texts and teaching were vernacular.[77] Designed to educate future businessmen, the abacus catered especially to young patrician males who looked forward to positions in trade and industry.

The small number of children in grammar school vis-à-vis the school population as a whole reflected the preprofessional conception of grammar training in the early decades of the fourteenth century. Boys seeking careers as clerics, notaries, lawyers, physicians, or grammar-school teachers had to have a solid preparation in Latin. Probably no girls attended the four big grammar schools mentioned by Villani, even though a few daughters of indulgent fathers may have received lessons at home.

Boys entering grammar school had first to read and understand the *donadello*, a version of Donatus's late-fourth-century Latin grammar. They had already encountered this text in the last years of elementary school, but whereas there they had memorized the text *a suono*, they now learned it *a senno*.[78] At a second stage, grammar students were assigned the series of short, didactic texts chosen mainly from the *Octo auctores*, heavily moralistic in content, already discussed in the last chapter. Only late in the fourteenth century did humanist influence result in the addition to the grammar-school curriculum of readings from ancient Latin authors.[79]

While drawing on a smaller reservoir of elementary-school students, most fourteenth-century grammar schools in central and

[77] Richard A. Goldthwaite, "Schools and Teachers of Commercial Arithmetic," *Journal of European Economic History* 1 (1972): 418–33, discusses the abacus school and its program.

[78] Black, "The Curriculum," 141–145.

[79] About 1401, a Dominican, Giovanni Dominici, pointed to the changed character of education in his native Florence: "Intendo i nostri antichi viddono lume dottrinando la puerizia, e i moderni fatti son ciechi, fuor della fede crescendo lor figliuoli. La prima cosa insegnavano era il saltero e dottrina sacra; e se gli mandavano più oltre, avevano moralità di Catone, fizioni d'Esopo, dottrina di Boezio, buona scienza di Prospero tratta di santo Agostino, e filosofia d'*Eva columba*, o *Tres leo naturas*, con un poco di poetizzata Scrittura santa nello *Aethiopum terras*; con simili libri, de' quali nullo insegnava mal fare. Ora si crescono i moderni figliuoli, e così invecchia l'apostatrice natura nel grembo degl'infedeli, nel mezzo degli atti disonesti sollicitanti la ancora impotente natura al peccato, ed insegnando tutti i vituperosi mali si possono pensare, nello studio d'Ovidio maggiore, delle pistole, *de arte amandi*, e più meretriciosi suoi libri e carnali scritture. Così si passa per Vergilio, tragedia e altri occupamenti, più insegnanti d'amare secondo carne che mostratori di buon costumi": *Regola del governo di cura familiare*, ed. Donato Salvi (Florence, 1860), 134–35.

northern Italy probably differed little from their Florentine counterparts in their reliance on traditional didactic texts for teaching Latin.[80] As I have suggested, the universities, at least Padua, Arezzo, and Bologna, together with a smattering of grammar schools, probably offered courses in the ancient authors as part of the curriculum since at least the second half of the thirteenth century, but this is difficult to prove. The outline given by Mussato for his course on Seneca in 1316 and the letter appointing Giovanni del Virgilio to the Bolognese *studio* in 1321 furnish the first solid proof that ancient literature was taught at the university level by these dates.[81] Guizzardo da Bologna's appointment to the short-lived Florentine *studio* between 1321 and 1322 meant that at least for that period, university training in ancient literature was available in Florence.[82] As for grammar-school education, the fact that a student like Coluccio Salutati, who completed his secondary education in Bologna in the

[80] Black, "The Curriculum," 146–47, provides a number of references to the classics being taught at the grammar-school level to sustain his position that, contrary to the claim of humanists at the time, the classics were taught in grammar school in "pre-humanist" Italy (145), which I take to mean before Petrarch. But to judge from his examples, he is referring to a period running possibly from the second quarter, possibly from the last half of the fourteenth century (depending on the identity of Goro d'Arezzo) to 1415. Except possibly for Goro d'Arezzo, who in addition to writing a *Regule parve* also composed a commentary on Lucan, all of Black's examples relate to the period after 1380. In the case of Goro, however, we cannot be sure whether this Goro is identical with a ser Gorello, who died after 1384, or a maestro Gregorio, who flourished about 1340: C. Marchesi, "Due grammatici del Medio Evo," *Bullettino della Società filologica romana* 12 (1910): 37. Furthermore, we do not know if Goro's commentary on Lucan was taught at the grammar-school level or at the Aretine *studio*. Finally, because, as Geri bears witness, Arezzo, like Padua, seems to have been precocious in teaching ancient literature at the grammar-school level, we should be cautious in using it as the basis for generalization.

Largely because of Black's evidence, however, Gehl, *A Moral Art*, maintains that ancient classics were read in Florentine grammar schools, presumably in the last stage of preparation. See, for example, 38–39, 54, 110, 134, and 186. He also believes that the practice of Florentine grammar masters of relying primarily on the standard medieval texts in teaching grammar was exceptional in northern and central Italy: ibid., 198–201 and 235. He writes critically of Florentine schoolmasters who "inherited a Latin program that had developed (at least potentially) into a carefully calibrated and broadly representative study of Latin literature from the ancient moral poets to modern spiritual and satirical authors" and that "by subtraction and restrictions" they "transformed this program into the pallid and repetitive study of a few moral precepts embodied in the words of mediocre authors" (238). I have found no evidence in thirteenth-century Florence that such a program existed.

[81] On Mussato, see above, 119, n. 9; on del Virgilio, see below, 237, n. 23.

[82] See above, 130. n. 39.

late 1340s, had no serious contact with pagan authors during his years in grammar school raises doubts about the availability of such training at that level even in Italy's largest university center.[83]

Even though Florence may have been a relative latecomer in introducing humanist reforms into its grammar schools, their introduction at the end of the century, thanks to the Florentine political and social context, nonetheless produced a revolutionary rethinking of the purpose of secondary education. The study of Latin literature would no longer be conceived in the narrow practical terms of preparing a student for a learned profession, while at the same time building his moral character. Instead, the study of literature – and by this was meant *ancient* literature – would come to be seen as the fundamental prerequisite to living the life of a free man. Regardless of a boy's intended career, whether law, business, or the church, training in the classics would become an essential part of his formation.[84]

The striking difference between the literate public of the mainland Veneto and that of eastern Tuscany helps explain the contrasting approaches to the ancients taken by scholars in the two regions in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Whereas in Florence the intellectual lay elite of the city after 1260 tended to serve as intermediaries between ancient culture and their fellow citizens by making the written products of that culture available in translation, the classicizing activities of the comparable elite in Padua were more exclusive. A work in classicizing Latin like Mussato's *Ecerinis* may have sparked some enthusiasm in the general public, but only as spectacle. It could not generate broad-based interest in having access to the ancient works that had inspired it.

As I have suggested previously, ancient Latin literature and medieval French literature represented two ethics in tension: the communal or civic on the one hand and the chivalric on the other. The evolving political situation in the Veneto, the center of intense literary activity in the early fourteenth century, worked to the advantage of chivalry. The emergence of princely court life there privileged the

[83] See below, 294-95.

[84] In 1402, however, the Capodistrian Pierpaolo Vergerio was the first to formulate a program of secondary education for the general student in his *De ingenuis moribus*. Although he wrote the work in Padua, he had by this time spent a number of years in Florence: see ch. 8.

formation of a new constellation of political and aesthetic values designed to amalgamate communal traditions with signorial rule. The Franco-Italian romance flourished in the courtly atmosphere, encouraging, at least at the highest levels of society, the integration of chivalric fantasy with courtly life. In contrast, although by no means deaf to the strains of chivalric romance, the Florentine upper class felt a pull toward the writings of antiquity.

Latini's parodic exploitation of Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose* in his *Tesoretto*, a sort of handbook of social conduct, reveals that the turn away from French culture was more than simply a growing interest in ancient literature. On a "grande piano giocondo," evocative of the *locus amoenus* (pleasant seat) of the *Roman*, the encounter of "Master Brunetto" with the virtues marked a high point in the work. Here, as in a vision, Latini beheld the courts of *Vertute*, "the chief and savior of refined custom and of good usage and good behavior" (lines 1239–41), and of her four daughters, the four cardinal virtues, *Prudenza*, *Temperanza*, *Fortezza*, and *Justizia* (lines 1245–47).[85] There were, in total, twenty virtues in the court, but Latini chose to speak only of four of them, "whom I obey and adore/ Very much with my heart."[86] Not coincidentally, the four are the virtues most closely associated with chivalry and the courtly ethic, *Cortesia* (Courtesy), *Largezza* (Largesse), *Leanza* (Loyalty), and *Prodezza* (Prowess). As each one in turn lectured a handsome knight on the manner in which his conduct should embody her instruction, it became clear that, by redefining their content, the author was out to claim these virtues as the ones belonging to a citizen.[87]

Latini used the subsequent meeting of "Master Brunetto" with the "God of Love" to manifest his intention both to correct and displace de Lorris as love's authority. By implication, Latini contrasted his negative view of love with the courtly eroticism of the immensely popular French text. Whereas de Lorris had authorized his version of love by relying on the Ovid of *Ars amatoria* and *Amores*, Brunetto

[85] I am using here the edition and translation of Julia Bolton Holloway, *Brunetto Latini: Il Tesoretto (The Little Treasure)* (New York and London, 1981).

[86] Lines 1336–39.

[87] *Leanza*, for example, admonishes the knight (lines 1939–41): "E volglio c'al tuo comune/ Rimossa ongni cagione/ Sie diritto e leale/ E già per nullo male/ Chenne possa avenire/ Ne lo lasciare perire." If the knight feels himself wronged, he should not seek revenge by resorting to violence, *Prodezza* advises (lines 2003–14), but rather should resort to the services of a lawyer.

countered by introducing the Ovid of the *Remedia amoris*, who – presumably as a way to authenticate Tuscan vernacular – "spoke to me in Italian" (line 2373), helping free him from love's commands and regain the path of virtue. Thus, Latini established his own literary authority through "a confrontation with and correction of the use of Ovid in the *Rose*."[88]

The monumental Italian effort to bypass French culture and establish a direct link with antiquity, of course, was Dante's *Commedia*, which, largely neglecting French cultural achievements, claimed the *Aeneid* as one of its major models and underwrote Dante's *auctoritas* by placing Virgil at his side through *Inferno* and *Purgatorio*, to the very gates of *Paradiso*.[89]

Florentine intellectuals like Latini, Giambono, and Dante were responding to the same felt need as Lovato and Mussato, albeit in a more popular, less scholarly fashion. In many ways over the previous hundred years, the French had instructed and entertained Italy, but by the last decades of the thirteenth century, members of the intellectual leadership in both Tuscany and the Veneto showed themselves ready to develop a constellation of ideas and values more in accord with the realities of their own society. To restate at this point what has been said earlier: The renewed Italian emphasis on ancient Roman literature and history in the second half of the thirteenth century reflected not merely a change in taste but a turning away from medieval values (agricultural, monarchical, ecclesiastical), represented by French culture, to values more fitting for an urban, communal, and secular society in which careers were more open to talent.

---

[88] This paragraph summarizes the argument of Kevin Brownlee, "The Practice of Cultural Authority: Italian Responses to French Cultural Dominance in *Il Tesoretto*, *Il Fiore*, and the *Commedia*," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 33 (1997): 259–261. The quotation is found on 261. Like the *Tesoretto* and *Commedia*, Brownlee argues that a third work, *Il fiore*, also manipulates the *Roman de la Rose* in an effort to evoke the model while denying its authority: "In this way, the Italian *Fiore* aggressively appropriates the French *Rose* into a newly emerging Italian cultural context" (263). See also his "Jason's Voyage and the Poetics of Rewriting: The *Fiore* and the *Roman de la Rose*," in *The Fiore in Context: Dante, France, Tuscany*, ed. Zygmunt G. Baranski et al. (Notre Dame and London, 1997), 167–82. As for Dante as the possible author, see Patrick Boyde, "The Results of the Poll: Presentation and Analysis," in ibid., 375, who writes that "10 years after the appearance of Contini's incomparable editions of the *Fiore*, his championship of the attribution or attributability of the poem to Dante Alighieri has not won universal assent." For a dating of the work in the late 1280s, see Brownlee, "The Practice of Cultural Authority," 261.

[89] Brownlee, "The Practice of Cultural Authority," 264.

Disposed to seek a new filter for their experience, thirteenth-century Italian intellectuals sought to recapture the roots of their culture and to define their relationship to it historically and linguistically. French culture had played loosely with the ancients, and the Italians had formed part of the audience. But the new effort of Italians to draw strength from their ancient progenitors was undertaken with filial reverence. The sacred character of the ancient language was insistently reaffirmed by imitating ancient style in Latin or by refashioning the vernacular in the image of the ancient model. Accurate translations formed counterparts to corrected editions of ancient texts, both seeking to reproduce classical diction.

A major difference between the Veneto and eastern Tuscany, however, lay in the degree to which discomfort with older values extended beyond the circle of the intellectual elite. More industrial and commercial by comparison with mainland Veneto cities, with greater social mobility and accessibility to political office, the urban populations of Tuscan cities, especially in the thriving centers of eastern Tuscany, had more reason to find the traditional system of values problematic.[90] Whereas the interest of Padua's classicizing scholars in promoting civic ethic may appear as a desperate and hopeless effort to halt further deterioration of communal government, the thriving communal structures of Tuscany made thinkers there relatively optimistic. The early disappearance of republican liberty in the mainland Veneto, however, did not lead to the bankruptcy of the whole classicizing enterprise, but rather to an uneven compromise with medieval traditions, represented in their secular dimension by the chivalric ethos. Although the balance between vernacular and Latin literature would shift somewhat in the fifteenth century, the attraction of chivalry, perhaps a persistent ingredient in western European culture, remained strong in the Veneto into the sixteenth century. Knighthood and its associations did hold some allure for the Florentine people, but in their civic life their influence remained peripheral.

[90] On the economic and demographic decay of Pisa after 1300, see David Herlihy, *Pisa in the Early Renaissance: A Study of Urban Growth* (New Haven, 1958), esp. 41–53.

4

Whereas ancient Latin literature and history – minus Cicero – might be said generically to have shaped the civic sense of Lovato and Mussato, that of Brunetto Latini was informed by the *Nicomachean Ethics*' analysis of morality and animated by Cicero's rhetorical ideal. The *Tresor*, Latini's major work, consisted of a preface outlining the branches of knowledge, followed by three books. In the first, Latini ranged from theology to physics to geography to housebuilding. In the second, he gave a partial translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, accompanied by a commentary and a discussion of vices and virtues. In the third, he dealt with rhetoric and politics, drawing for rhetoric on his own *Rettorica* and for politics on James of Viterbo's *De regimine civitatum*. The originality of the *Tresor* lay in Latini's reinsertion of the ethical and political ideas of Aristotle and Cicero into their urban, civic setting and his emphasis on rhetoric as primarily connected with the act of speaking.[91]

Rhetoric, for Latini as for Cicero, taught more than mere style. Historically it had exercised a civilizing function, convincing men to desert their bestial lives by establishing cities governed by order and justice:

> Tully says that the highest science of governing the city is rhetoric, that is to say, the science of speaking; for without speaking, there were not and would not have been cities or the institution of justice or human companionship.[92]

Latini then presented the art of speaking, and examined the obligations of public officeholders. Rhetoric emerged as the most important aspect of political science and the major nourisher of public and private morality. Still inspired by memories of the *primo popolo* and its popular assemblies, Latini revealed his allegiance to communal government when he described how eloquence promoted the moral and political virtues on which such government depended.[93]

---

[91] Albertus Magnus (1206–80) was the first Scholastic to apply Aristotle's ethics to city politics. For Albertus, a quarrel between the prince–archbishop of Cologne and his city inspired the commentary: Anthony Black, *Political Thought in Europe 1250–1450* (Cambridge,1992), 121.

[92] *Tresor*, III.1; 317.

[93] I have followed here the excellent exposition by Cary J. Nederman, "The Union of Wisdom and Eloquence before the Renaissance: The Ciceronian Orator in Medieval Thought," *Journal of Medieval History* 18 (1992): 86–88. For a critique, how-

In order to appreciate the significance of Latini's development of the Ciceronian ideal as he found it in the *De inventione*, we must say something about the medieval tradition surrounding the interpretation of the work's opening passages (*Inv.* I.1.1–3). There Cicero articulated the link between wisdom, speech, and virtue and provided a sketch of how an eloquent orator created human society.

For antecedents to Latini's conception of the ideal orator, we must turn to northern Europe. Perhaps the most extensive medieval discussion was in the *Metalogicon* of John of Salisbury (d. 1180), who championed the *auctores* tradition against a certain Cornificius, who denied the need for intensive study of the liberal arts. After presenting the trivium as the foundation of a proper education, John followed Cicero in defining the faculty of speech as the essential characteristic of human beings, and in words echoing the opening chapters of *De inventione*, he argued that eloquence together with reason had given birth to human society.[94]

Within the treatise as a whole, the term *eloquentia* seems to have been used by John in three ways: (1) negatively, as a superficial concern with style; and (2) positively, as (a) a product of the art of rhetoric, or (b) more generally, a product of all three members of the trivium. In an analysis that focused principally on grammar and dialectic, however, rhetoric assumed a subordinate role, becoming equivalent to the domain of probabilistic argumentation.[95] Conceiv-

---

ever, of Nederman's general argument that the conception of the Ciceronian orator formed an integral part of the medieval tradition (ibid., 75–95), see my remarks on the following pages.

[94] *Metalogicon*, ed. J.B. Hill, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio med., no. 98 (Turnhold, 1991), 13: "Miror itaque non tamen satis, quia non possum, quid sibi vult qui eloquentiae negat esse studendum .... Sicut enim eloquentia non modo temeraria est sed etiam caeca quam ratio non illustrat, sic et sapientia quae usu verbi non proficit, non modo debilis est, sed quadam modo manca ... Haec autem est illa dulcis et fructuosa coniugatio rationis et verbi, quae tot egregias genuit urbes, tota conciliavit et foederavit regna, tot univit populos et caritate devinxit, ut hostis omnium publicus merito censeatur quisquis hoc quod ad utilitatem omnium Deus coniunxit, nititur separare."

[95] Mary Bride Ryan, "John of Salisbury on the Arts of Language in the Trivium," Ph.D. Diss., Catholic University of America, 1958, 164–68. While John envisages grammar as laying the foundation for the orator (*Metalogicon*, I.25: 55), his description of the range of activities covered by the grammarian, as represented by Bernard of Chartres, leaves little for the orator to do (ibid., I.24: 51–55). In line with a medieval tradition beginning at least with Alcuin, John's assigns a wide field to grammar. As Ryan writes (33): "Not only poetry, but history, the various forms of prose, and figures of speech are all, in John's scheme, appropriated to grammar." See below, 343, n. 39. Rhetoric is also hedged in on the other side by dialectic.

ing of eloquence in a scholarly rather than an open, public setting, John de-emphasized the orator or oratorical aspect of the Ciceronian conception, embuing the term "eloquence" with dialectical attributes that made it potentially applicable to metaphysical and theological writings.[96]

John's tendency to see rhetoric as a part of logic culminated in the thirteenth century, as the influence of the New Logic intensified. Opposing the tendency, which in Aquinas's version identified rhetoric as a division of probabilistic logic, was the older, Augustinian position, conceiving of rhetoric narrowly as language designed to move the believer to subscribe to the teachings of theology.[97] Neither position captured the function of rhetoric as Cicero had conceived of it: in the first, rhetoric tended to shrivel to a form of philosophical proof, and in the second, while it retained its associations with *ornatus*, the discipline lost its primary focus on cultivating virtue.

Unconcerned with the moral or theoretical implications of rhetoric, a third group of writers, the writers of manuals of *ars poetrie*, *ars predicandi*, *ars dictaminis*, and *ars arengandi*, emphasized the mechanics of persuasion. A few of the authors, in the prefaces to their manuals, echoed Cicero in a sentence claiming a bond between eloquence and moral philosophy, but their interest in the connection ended there.[98]

Among none of Cicero's northern European interpreters did actual orations play a role. In his enormous *Speculum historiale*, written in the middle years of the thirteenth century, Vincent of Beauvais testified to medieval Europe's awareness of at least the existence of many

[96] Daniel D. McGarry, "Educational Theory in the *Metalogicon* of John of Salisbury," *Speculum* 23 (1948): 669–71. As McGarry writes, rhetoric "is tucked away as a subdivision of probable logic, while its 'thunder' is discovered in the possession of grammar" (671).

[97] Richard McKeon, "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 17 (1942): 15–29, outlines three medieval conceptions of rhetoric.

[98] Wieruszowski, "*Ars dictaminis* in the Time of Dante," in her *Politics and Culture*, 363 and 372–73, gives more detail. While identifying Latini as insisting on the Ciceronian link between eloquence, wisdom, and virtue, Nederman, "The Union of Wisdom and Eloquence," traces this ideal at least back to the early twelfth century, to the commentary of Thierry of Chartres on Cicero's *De inventione*, and forward from Latini to scholastic thinkers such as John Quidort and Marsilio of Padua. Nederman rightly criticizes my assertion in *The Earthly Republic of the Italian Humanists* (Philadelphia, 1976), 7, that Bruni was the first to revive the Ciceronian ideal of eloquence. As I argue here, however, because Cicero's conception of eloquence focused primarily on oratory, the Ciceronian ideal of eloquence was revived only with Latini, and not in the twelfth century as Nederman asserts.

of the speeches now identified as belonging to the ancient writer.[99] In practice, however, medieval writers only dipped into the speeches, largely in search of moral and philosophical truths. For instance, the writings of John of Salisbury were dotted with citations from the oratorical works, but their usage suggests that John viewed Cicero more as a philosopher than as an orator.[100] For their part, Italian *dictatores* used *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* idiosyncratically to produce their own letters, but there is no indication that they ever read the ancient orator's speeches.

By contrast, Latini revived the Ciceronian ideal by conceiving of rhetoric as oratorical rhetoric and as a discipline whose practical goals dictated its theoretical considerations. Latini constructed his image of the orator as a person who guided the moral development of society through his speeches. Latini's vernacular translations of Ciceronian eloquence were designed to serve as models for contemporary orators.

A hugely popular work in fourteenth-century Italy, the *Tresor* promoted Latini's blend of Aristotle and Cicero among a broad vernacular reading public. Nonetheless, it is difficult to find any specific restatement of Latini's link between virtue and oratory before 1400.[101] Although Petrarch was to formulate the ultimate goal of humanism in great detail in terms of the Ciceronian ideal, he would do so largely without making Cicero's close association between virtue and oratorical rhetoric. Salutati imitated Petrarch in his conception of rhetoric, as he did in so many things. Latini's inheritance had

[99] In VII.6, he numbers the orations among Cicero's other works.

[100] *Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive De nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum Libri VIII*, ed. C.C.I. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1909), 2:481–82, provides an index of John's references to the speeches. On the medieval attitude toward speeches generally, see Hans Baron, *In Search of Florentine Civic Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1988), 1:106–07.

[101] Nederman, "The Union of Wisdom and Eloquence," 88–93, argues that John of Paris and Marsilio of Padua continue the "traditional" conception of the Ciceronian orator. While it is true that Latini's contemporary, John of Paris, repeats the Ciceronian version of the foundation of human society, there is no indication that John saw a role for oratorical rhetoric in the civil society of his own world. Similarly, in the somewhat later case of Marsilio, who employed the same notion of the origins of civil society, it is not at all clear that Marsilio's insistence that law be a result of public discussion in which *prudentes* endeavor to explain proposed legislation to their fellow citizens reflects the centrality of oratory in his view of politics. Marsilio never says that these *prudentes* should receive training in oratory, nor is it clear from his own scholastic-like presentation that he conceives of these public discussions as concerned with *eloquentia*.

to await Vergerio and Bruni for its recovery; only then did humanism return to its Ciceronian dress.

Latini, however, had already gone a long way toward re-establishing the historical context in which Cicero lived and wrote. For Latini, Cicero was no longer primarily the philosopher or the orator depicted by most medieval Latin writers nor the "d'arme maraviglioso cavaliere" of Guidotto da Bologna. Instead, Latini portrayed Cicero primarily as a statesman defending Roman liberty. He particularly praised Cicero for his struggle against Catiline, who threatened through conspiracy to impose a tyranny on the Republic. As Latini wrote in his *Rettorica*:

> And there [in the *De inventione*] where he [Cicero] says ... "our commune," I read "Rome," since Tully was a citizen of Rome, new and of no high rank, but for his wisdom he held such a place that all Rome was controlled by his voice, and this was at the time of Catiline, of Pompey, and of Julius Caesar, and for the good of his country he was completely opposed to Catiline. And then, in the war between Pompey and Julius Caesar, he sided with Pompey, like all those wise men who loved the state of Rome.[102]

Intent on isolating the values central to well-ordered communal government and constructing an ideal type of citizen, Latini used passages on Cicero in *I fatti di Cesare* to develop a new interpretation of the significance of the ancient Roman's career.[102bis] Cicero's example in turn underwrote Latini's own activities as a citizen who used his oratorical skills to defend the freedom of his commune in the assemblies. Latini's new portrait of Cicero was subsequently echoed in Dante, Remigio de' Girolami, and then Villani.[103] Had Petrarch known this Florentine Cicero, he would have been less shocked upon discovering the ancient Roman's political activity in the pages of Cicero's letters in *Ad Atticum*.

Latini used vernacular to express his original views on the political importance of Cicero's writings because he wanted the writings to have an effect on a wide public. In so doing, he alerted his fellow citizens to the potential relevance of ancient literature for an appreciation of their own lives. That members of the Florentine upper class

---

[102] This quotation, as well as the analysis of Brunetto's attitude toward Cicero, is taken from Charles T. Davis, "Brunetto Latini and Dante," in his *Dante's Italy and Other Essays* (Philadelphia, 1984), 171–74.

[102bis] *I fatti di Cesare: Testo di lingua inedito del secolo XIV*, ed. L. Banchi (Bologna, 1863), 13 and 197-98.

[103] Ibid., 174–76.

subsequently commissioned vernacular translations of other authors suggests that Latini's effort was not wasted. While susceptible to fits of religious passion and exaggerated ritual gestures, the Tuscan urban leaders apparently sensed the relevance of ancient secular culture to their own circumstances. In it lay a potential for justifying their status as rich landowners whose primary residence was in the city, who were collectively involved in ruling a city-state, and who at the same time engaged in commercial and industrial ventures. Their situation had no counterpart in medieval northern Europe.

As among the Paduans, the tension among Florentines between the old rural, monarchical, and ecclesiastical values of the Middle Ages and the evolving character of Italian urban life led to the articulation of republican sentiments, but, as in the Paduan case, the articulation stopped short of a theory of republicanism. Of Latini's republican commitment there can be no doubt. At the outset of book II of the *Tresor* he cryptically stated without further comment that there were three forms of government:

> the one is that of kings, the second that of the good, the third that of the communes, which is by far the best among the others.[104]

The third type of government, where citizens chose their leaders, he wrote in book III, provided the people with "the greatest possible benefit."[105] Latini never undertook to justify such statements, however, with theoretical or historical arguments.[106]

5

To express such arguments would have required a linguistic apparatus that early Tuscan vernacular did not evince. The language games

[104] *Tresor*, II.44; 211.

[105] Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (New York and London, 1978), 1:42.

[106] The *Tresor*, however, provides a practical instance of the superiority of republics (392) in that kings "vendent les provostés et les baillent a ciaus ki plus l'achatent (poi gardent sa bonté ne le proufit des borgois)." In contrast, "en Italie, que li citain et li borgois et li communité des viles eslisent lor poesté et lor signour tel comme il quident qu'il soit plus proufitables au commun preu de la vile et de tous lor subtés." For various comments on these passages, see Edward P. Mahoney, "From the Medievals to the Early Moderns: Themes and Problems in Renaissance Political Thought," in *Les philosophies morales et politiques au moyen âge: Actes du IXe Congrès internationale de philosophie médiévale: Ottawa, du 17 au 22 août 1992*, ed. B. C. Bazán, et al., 3 vols. (New York, 1995), 1:211, n. 16.

of political theory and political history could only be played with the proper equipment, and it was equipment that Latini, despite his extensive self-instruction, did not yet possess. Rhetoric in Tuscany had been a completely practical tradition, and within that context, Latini's bald statement that republics were good was not the oddity that, from the perspective of modern political theory, it would one day appear.[107] No vernacular writer of the next century would manifest anything matching Latini's political sophistication. Occasional preambles to official Florentine documents, scattered remarks by participants in communal councils, or a phrase or line in the work of a vernacular writer would express not only pride in Florence's political institutions but an awareness of the value of republican government as a form of constitution. On the basis of existing historical sources, though, Latini, in the second half of the thirteenth century, perhaps inspired by the vicissitudes of *il primo popolo*, marks the high point of vernacular republicanism before 1400.[108]

The Paduans, Lovato and Mussato, inherited the same intellectually impoverished rhetorical tradition, but, unlike the Tuscans, they chose to continue, like the *dictatores*, to write in Latin. It is difficult to say which approach, Latin imitation of ancient models or vernacular translation, had the greater transforming effect on contemporary society and culture. As my analysis will demonstrate, the availability of vernacular translation created an audience aware of the richness of the classical literary heritage. This happened first in Florence, center of the translation enterprise, where professional humanists first enjoyed the support of both the commune and private individuals and where by 1400 the humanist curriculum was being established in the city's schools.

From the cognitive point of view, however, the Latin approach of humanism to the ancient authors, while only in its first stages in the Paduans' work, had a greater transforming effect. The increasing

[107] John Najemy, "Brunetto Latini's 'Politica,'" *Dante Studies* 112 (1994): 36–37, ascribes the lack of a theoretical discussion of republicanism to Brunetto's realization that Florence under Charles of Anjou would be politically very different from the city under the *primo popolo*. That assumes, though, that as early as 1266, the latest probable date for the completion of the *Tresor*, Latini expected Charles of Anjou, who conquered Naples in October 1266, later to make himself master of Florence.

[108] See my "The Concept of Republican Liberty in Italy," in *Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, ed. A. Molho and J.A. Tedeschi (Dekalb, Ill., 1970), 190–93, for the first three-quarters of the fourteenth century. Cf. Nicolai Rubinstein, "Florentina libertas," *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 26 (1986): 5–9.

faithfulness with which Florentine and Tuscan translators generally endeavored to reproduce the original in versions of contemporary artistic merit necessarily involved an accommodation between ancient and contemporary ways of thought. While the style and ideas of the original exercised a structuring influence on Florentine thought and its language, nonetheless, the passage from Latin to the vernacular involved slippage.

Florentine translators were working with a multipurpose linguistic instrument – Tuscan – that was already inscribed with a range of thoughts and feelings alien to those found in the ancient originals. While the translators strove to supplement their native language lexically and syntactically and to model it closely on Latin, the intimate associations of the vernacular with other thought patterns inevitably made it difficult to keep the classical inspiration in focus. In his translations of Ciceronian orations, for instance, Latini rendered *respublica* as *commune*, *miles* as *cavaliere*, *viri eminentissimi* as *baroni*, and *tantus sceler ... in conspectu deorum penatium* as *manifesto peccatore ... in conspetto di Dio*.[109] Such terminology domesticated the ancient text, but attenuated the effect of the confrontation between cultures.[110] The polysemic associations of the ancient vocabulary were obscured by those of the modern. Although the translations made the contents of a large body of ancient literature accessible to a wide public, the use of the vernacular reduced the potential of ancient writings to modify contemporary patterns of thought and speech.

It should also be observed that the translator approached the ancient texts with such reverence that he saw them as unitary wholes rather than as constructed artifacts. While properly translating the text required a thorough understanding of its meaning, the focus of the translator nonetheless necessarily looked away from the original toward the vernacular creation. Accepting the original text as a given, he was concerned with how to shape his vernacular to express with elegance and exactness what the ancient author had written. This attitude helps explain why most translators showed little concern for philology. Like scholars in earlier centuries, they apparently

[109] The Latin words and phrases contrast with the Tuscan ones as follows: "state" vs. "commune"; "soldier" vs. "knight"; "most eminent men" vs. "barons"; "such a criminal ... in the presence of his household gods" vs. "a manifest sinner ... in the sight of God."

[110] Maggini, *I primi volgarizzamento*, 30, 32, 101, and 86, respectively.

took the first legible manuscript at hand of a text as the basis for their vernacular version.

The problem of what I have called "slippage" also affected translators when they wrote their own works in the vernacular. For Latini, in the *Tesoretto*, although the valence of terms like *cortesia* (courtly manners) and *prodezza* (bravery) shifted to emphasize civic values, traditional chivalric associations remained – Latini was not immune to their attractions. His ambivalence was apparent in the rules he laid down for *largezza* (largesse). In describing the rules for attaining *cortesia*, the personification of that virtue itself, describing *largezza* as "il capo e la grandezza/ di tutto mio mestero" (lines 1588–89), admonished its knightly disciple:

> Friend, guard well;
> However much wealth you own,
> Do not hasten to use it,
> For you will appear a fool
> Or you will spend whatever there is (lines 1671–74).[111]

When *Largezza* spoke for herself, however, she eschewed such a cautious approach, and recommended at one point a generosity suggestive of the courtly ethic:

> And so in all places
> Remember your station,
> But spend freely;
> And I do not want you to be daunted
> If you spend more
> Than is reasonable in a season;
> Instead, it is my will
> That you should pretend
> Not to see at times
> If money or merchandise
> Vanish with honor;
> Consider this to be better (1402–12).[112]

Apparently Latini could not wield an old ethical nomenclature to articulate a new set of values without some backsliding.

---

[111] Holloway, *Brunetto Latini*, 84–85. The Italian reads: "Amico, guarda bene:/ Compiù riccho di téne/ Non ti calglia d'usare/ Chè starai per giullare/ O spenderai quant'essi."

[112] Ibid., 72–73: "Ti membri di tu'stato/ Ma spendi allegramente;/ Ne non vo' che sgomente/ Se più che sia ragione/ Dispendi a la stagione;/ Anz'è di mio volere/ Che tu di non vedere/ T'infinghe a le fiate/ Se denari o derrate/ Ne vanno per honore;/ Pensa che sia melliore."

This brief discussion of Latini's work is designed to illustrate how, despite the fact that the Tuscan vernacular evolved in a "classicizing" direction parallel with that taken by Latin at the hands of the northern Italian humanists, novel ancient patterns of thought became contaminated by the vernacular's accessibility to other well-established modes of thinking. Classicizing humanists maintained their own dialogue with antiquity, but, eager to imitate ancient literature in Latin, they were less liable to dilute the impact of the encounter. Although the translations and original works by Tuscans of the period reveal their awareness of the relevance of the Roman example for their own time and of the potentiality for gaining mastery of the historical process by understanding the past, the Tuscans' approach, if preparing the way for large scale acceptance of the humanist program, could not effect the same degree of cognitive change.

Whereas for the Florentines ancient Latin provided a higher aesthetic standard than the vernacular, for the Paduans it represented aesthetic perfection. In seeking to meet the ancient authors on their own terms, if in an asymmetrical relationship, the humanists sought to acquire the technical skill for achieving *vetustas* in their own compositions. The classicizing effort thereby entailed the reconstruction of their contemporary experience in terms of the ancient language. Thus, the Paduans, like the Florentines, were involved in a process of translation, but in their case the relationship was reversed.

Although by the death of Mussato this tendency of mind was only in its early stages, it would become a persistent feature of Italian humanist thinking. In time, it would become diffused in the larger society by means of the humanist program in the schools.

6

As we have seen in Padua, the task of providing a theoretical justification for republicanism, unfulfilled by Lovato and his immediate followers, was accomplished by a scholastic: Marsilio of Padua. In Tuscany the same role was fulfilled by another scholastic, in this case a Dominican friar, Ptolemy of Lucca, who, twenty years before Marsilio, not only elaborated a republican conception of government, but presented his political ideas within a historical context.

Writing in Latin for a clerical, Latin-reading public, perhaps while in the years he spent living in Florence at Santa Maria Novella,

Ptolemy expressed his ideas in a continuation of Thomas Aquinas's uncompleted *De regimine principum*, whose justification of monarchy was built on some arguments of medieval tradition, others drawn from Roman history, and others from Aristotle.[113] The definitive establishment of guild rule in Florence, anchored after 1293 by the Ordinances of Justice and reinforced after 1295 by the defeat of the demagogue Corso Donati, may well have stimulated Ptolemy to breach the traditional confines of scholastic political discussion, which began with the assumed superiority of monarchical government of some variety.

Scholastic Latin was a language for theorizing, a language shorn of chivalric and romance elements. By 1300, it had incorporated from Aristotle a vocabulary with attendant conceptual associations that encouraged a sophisticated discussion of government not possible within the traditional Augustinian–Gregorian frame of reference. A partisan of communal government, Ptolemy conjoined a theoretical discussion informed by Aristotle with a historical critique to produce the first republican political treatise of the Middle Ages.

The major architect of the new constellation of Aristotelian political conceptions, Thomas Aquinas, had remained convinced of the superiority of monarchy to any other form of government, but in other works he had allowed for a measure of popular consent in an effort to pacify the demand of the masses for political expression.[114] In the *De regimine principum*, however, he held himself to defending the monarchical principle and to discussing the duties of kingship, except for a section in the midst of the exposition (I.4), where he commented on the evils committed by Rome's early kings and by later Roman emperors. Although some of Rome's princes had served the state

[113] Thomas is credited with having written bks. I and II down to bk. II, ch. 8. Ptolemy completed the second book and added two more: Charles T. Davis, "Roman Patriotism and Republic Propaganda: Ptolemy of Lucca and Pope Nicholas II," in *Dante's Florence*, 224–25. Ptolemy probably wrote his parts in 1301 in Florence at Santa Maria Novella: Davis, "Ptolemy of Lucca and the Roman Republic," in *Dante's Florence*, 268–69. I have used the edition of the work published in Thomas Aquinas, *Opera omnia*, vol. 16 (Parma, 1864), 225–91. Variant readings are found in the edition of J. Perrier in *Opuscula omnia* (Paris, 1949). I am grateful to Prof. Charles T. Davis for the latter reference. For a detailed bibliography of works on Ptolemy, see E. Panella, "Tolomée de Lucques," *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et histoire*, vol. 15 (1990), 1017–19.

[114] James Blythe, *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1992), esp. 301–07.

well, Aquinas wrote, most of them had been tyrants and had reduced the Roman state to nothing. To his mind, however, responsibility for the rise of such tyrannical government could be laid at the doorstep of popular government, whose disorders invited the imposition of arbitrary power:

> The rule of many usually produces tyranny not less but more frequently than does a monarchy. It follows, that it is ... more expedient to live under one king than under the rule of many.[115]

Thus, criticisms that might have been seen as support for republican government concluded in an argument for the superiority of monarchy.

Ptolemy's continuation of Aquinas's treatise, by contrast, oriented the discussion in favor of republican government. For him, only where the conduct of the ruler was regulated by statute could law be said to prevail. In a monarchy, what pleased the king was law, and however good the monarch, he was still above the law. Consequently, Ptolemy was led to identify monarchy with despotism and define it as a form of government appropriate for slaves and brutish men. Civilized people merited republican government, which permitted them to make the laws they were to obey. For the Italy of his day, therefore, Ptolemy was convinced that republican government was absolutely the best form of political rule.

In his interpretation of Roman history, Ptolemy agreed with Aquinas in criticizing the early kings as tyrants, and he specifically singled out Caesar for having suppressed Roman liberty. But unlike Aquinas, he used that criticism as ammunition to prove the inferiority of monarchy to republican government. When it came to the emperors, Ptolemy also went his own way. That was partly because for him the imperial office constituted a sort of halfway constitutional form between regal and republican forms. More important, however, since he saw Christian history as having been intimately connected with Rome from the reign of Augustus, Roman history after Caesar became ecclesiastical, and the popes rather than the emperors came to play the central role. He seems to have envisaged Italy as divided into a series of republican communes somehow acting under papal supervision.

Insightful as his work was, it appears to have had little impact.

---

[115] *De regimine principum*, I.4.

Partly, perhaps, that was because at points Ptolemy tended to obfuscate his otherwise clear distinction between *principatus regalis-despoticus* and *principatus politicus*. But more significantly, the fact that his republican ideas were contained in a continuation of Aquinas's *De regimine principum* lessened their impact. After having absorbed the promonarchical theories, contemporaries must have found the prorepublican arguments of the rest of the work more perplexing than convincing. Traditional monarchical prejudice aided in distorting Ptolemy's views.[116] Neither the republican ideas of Bruni's *Laudatio Florentinae urbis* nor those of any Quattrocento political thinker before Savonarola owed any obvious debts to the Dominican republican theorist.[117]

7

That Florence was not an alternate site for early humanism in Dante's generation probably had little to do with the exiling of two of its

[116] This summary of Ptolemy's thought is based on Davis, "Ptolemy of Lucca," 275–78 and 286–89; and idem, "Roman Patriotism," 229–53. See also my *Salutati and His Letters*, 78–79; Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:52, 54–55, 59; and Blythe, *Ideal Government*, 92–117.

A contemporary Florentine Dominican, Remigio de' Girolami, harangued his fellow citizens with sermons on the need to serve the common good. The sermons suggest only by implication that the common good was best served by popular rule. On Remigio, see Nicolai Rubinstein, "Marsilius of Padua and the Italian Political Thought of His Time," in *Europe in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. J. Hale, R.T. Highfield, and B. Smalley (Evanston, Ill., 1965), 50–59; Charles T. Davis, "An Early Florentine Political Theorist: Fra Remigio de' Girolami," and "Ptolemy of Lucca and the Roman Republic," both in *Dante's Italy* (Philadelphia, 1984), 198–223 and 254–88. Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:28–65, treats Ptolemy, Latini, and Remigio among others from this period. D.L. D'Avray, *Death and the Prince: Memorial Preaching before 1350* (Oxford, 1994), 142–47, discusses Remigio's sharp distinction between princes and tyranny in his sermon on the death of Louis X of France. For more bibliography, see esp. E. Panella, "Remi dei Girolami," *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et histoire*, vol. 13 (1987), 343–47, which includes in its listing Panella's extensive contribution to the study of Remigio.

[117] On Savonarola's use of Ptolemy, see Edward P. Mahoney, "From the Medievals to the Early Moderns," 1:196.

Skinner, *Foundations*, 1:55–56 and 62–65, considers Bartolus of Sassoferrato to be another republican theorist. But this is to overlook Bartolus's flexible approach to political regimes, based on the size of the polity. Although he considered republican government ideal for small cities like Perugia, Bartolus preferred an aristocracy for Florence and Venice, and a monarchy for the largest political communities: Bartolus de Sassoferrato, *De regimine civitatis*, in Diego Quaglioni, *Politica e diritto nel Trecento italiano: Il "De tyranno di Bartolo da Sassoferrato (1314–1357)* (Florence, 1983), 162–68.

most eminent intellectuals in the first decade of the fourteenth century: that of Petrarch's father, ser Petracco, and that of Dante himself in 1302. In 1306 Convenevole da Prato, Petrarch's future teacher, was exiled by neighboring Prato. Ser Petracco's philological interests appeared only late in his life in Avignon and then were closely linked to those of his son. As for Convenevole, his status as a humanist at any point in his career is open to question.[118] In Dante's case as well, there is little to suggest that his continued presence in the city would have given a humanistic direction to the city's culture. Dante's exile, however, had enormous consequences for the poet's own development, because it put him in intimate contact with urban centers where manuscripts of ancient authors abounded and where their contents were passionately studied.

We know nothing about Dante's early education other than that Latini could have been his grammar-school master.[119] Whether or not this was the case, Latini's own dependence on intermediary sources for his frequent references to ancient poets in the *Tresor* underlines the general neglect of those poets in Florentine literary life and makes it probable that, if Dante was Latini's pupil, then Dante did not study ancient poetry in grammar school.[120] Given the structure of the medieval grammar-school curriculum, it is even less likely that Dante would have read ancient prose writers. It is tempting to believe that it was in Latini's classroom, however, that the young student learned the rudiments of the brilliant *dictamen* style that he

[118] See the discussion of Convenevole's writings below, 233-34.

[119] The intense relationship between Dante and Brunetto Latini suggested by *Inferno*, 15, line 84, has led some scholars to believe that Latini had formally taught Dante. This is quite possibly true. On the discussion, see Giorgio Petrocchi, *Vita di Dante* (Rome and Bari, 1984), 31–32. In his masterly essay, "Education in Dante's Florence," in his *Dante's Italy*, 137–65, Charles T. Davis describes the educational situation in Florence in Dante's youth. He refers to the dearth of manuscripts of ancient literature in the city (141–44).

[120] Marigo, "Cultura letteraria e preumanistica," 313–17, maintains that the overwhelming number of classical citations that Latini used in his writings were taken from secondary works. Francesco Maggini, *La Rettorica italiana di Brunetto Latini* (Florence, 1912), 52, concludes that of the ancient Latin authors, Latini knew Sallust, Lucan, Cicero, and perhaps Ovid's *Heroides*, although he admits that in the latter case, Latini may have taken his citations from a French translation (44–46). Marigo, however, counters that, apart from the works of Cicero that Latini translated, even were he drawing his citations from the Latin originals, they might have been only excerpts ("Cultura letteraria," 317). Carmody identifies the medieval sources on which Latini drew for his references in the work (*Tresor*, xxvi–xxxii).

later displayed in his correspondence.[121] It may not be a coincidence that both men showed themselves masters of *stilus rhetoricus*, the most difficult form of *stilus altus* in the arsenal of thirteenth-century *dictamen* and a style rare by the second half of the thirteenth century.

After his grammar-school education, had he been willing, Dante could probably have learned a good deal about reading ancient Latin prose from informal contact with Latini. Latini had no apparent interest in poetry but he had unique linguistic abilities and an extraordinary talent for writing prose. He composed his masterpiece, the *Tresor*, in a foreign language after a few years residence in France and within the same period he mastered enough ancient Latin prose to be able to produce a faithful translation of a portion of Cicero's *De inventione*. But the young Dante appears not to have sought out Latini's informal help.

Passionately absorbed in developing his creative talents in composing vernacular poetry, Dante himself later implied that, until the death of Beatrice in June 1290, when he had been in his midtwenties, he had had little need for other intellectual stimulation. Overwhelmed by grief, it was then, he tells us in *Convivio* II.12, that he turned to Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae* and Cicero's *De amicitia*. But he encountered difficulty in reading the Latin:

> and it happened that first it was difficult for me to understand their meaning, but finally I entered into it as far as I could with the grammar I had and a little of my native insight.

Granted that Dante may have had problems comprehending the philosophical concepts of Boethius, but if Dante's Latin had been good, then it is hardly credible that Cicero's arguments in *De amicitia* would have taxed his understanding.[122] The fact is that Dante's

[121] For Latini's *dictamen* style and his treatise of *ars dictaminis*, see above, 184–85. One of the most recent of the many editions of Dante's prose letters is *Epistole*, ed. Arsenio Frugoni and Giorgio Brugnoli, in *Opere minori*, 3 vols. (Milan and Naples, 1995–96), 3:2:522–643.

[122] The whole passage reads: "e misimi a leggere quello non conosciuto da molti libro di Boezio, nel quale, cattivo e discacciato, consolato s'avea. E udendo ancora che Tullio scritto avea un altro libro, nel quale, trattando de l'Amistade, avea toccate parole de la consolazione di Lelio, uomo eccelentissimo, ne la morte di Scipione amico suo, misimi a leggere quello. E avegna che duro mi fosse ne la prima entrare ne la loro sentenza, finalmente v'entrai tanto entro, quanto l'arte di gramatica ch'io avea e un poco di mio ingegno potea fare": *Il convivio*, ed. Cesare Vasoli and Domenico de Robertis, in *Opere minori*, 3 vols. (Milan and Naples, 1995–96), 2:202–03. In their edition of *Il convivio*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1934–37), 1:180–82, n. 6, G.

grammar-school training in *ars dictaminis* afforded him scant preparation for reading the syntactically and lexically complicated Latin of ancient authors and it required considerable effort for him to read these pagan texts.[123]

In the period after Beatrice's death, Dante also sought consolation by frequently attending lectures in natural science and theology at the schools of the Franciscans and Dominicans.[124] His intellectual awakening probably also extended to a new interest in ancient Latin poetry, and here he would not have encountered the same reading problems that he did with ancient prose. Dante's education in grammar, based on texts in verse such as Aesop, Prudentius, and Prosper, would have given him the skills necessary for understanding ancient poetry. Judging from Dante's writings before his departure from Florence in 1302, however, it does not seem that his knowledge of the ancient poets was extensive.

In fact, his work before 1302 contains only two instances of direct quotations from their work. Both were in the *Vita nuova*, probably finished about 1294, and at least one was borrowed from a medieval author. Early in the book (ch. 2), Dante included (II.8–9) a quotation from Homer: "She appeared not a daughter of a mortal man, but of a God," in all probability borrowed from *De intellectu et intelligibili*, a short tract on natural science by the thirteenth-century Scholastic,

---

Busnelli and G. Vandelli interpret Dante here as saying that he had difficulty following the concepts of the two writers. Paride Chistoni, *La seconda fase del pensiero dantesco: Periodo degli studi sui classici e filosofi antichi e sugli espositori medievale* (Livorno, 1903), 40–44, summarizes nineteenth-century interpretations of this passage and shares my view.

Davis, "Education in Dante's Florence," 142, expresses surprise that one of the most popular texts of the Middle Ages, Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*, would have been "non conosciuto da molti." I would add my surprise that Dante had apparently only recently heard of the existence of the *De amicitia*.

[123] It must be said that Dante's difficulty in reading Latin prose, given the nature of medieval education, tells us nothing about his ability to read poetry.

[124] Patrick Boyde, *Dante, Philomythes and Philosopher: Man in the Cosmos* (Cambridge and London, 1981), 21–26, divides Dante's education into "two ages," in the first of which he was passionately devoted to vernacular poetry. In the five years after the death of Beatrice, he entered into the "second age," when he came to see that "speculation and contemplation – the use of the intellect to seek out, know, and enjoy the truth – was man's highest activity, the only activity that could give enduring satisfaction and happiness" (25). Boyde identifies his turning for consolation to Cicero's *De amicitia* and Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae* as the first phase of the "second age."

Albertus Magnus.[125] Later, in ch. 25, sec. 9, Dante cited lines from the first and third books of the *Aeneid*, together with corroborating quotations from Horace, Lucan, and Ovid, to illustrate the poetic practice of giving speech to inanimate objects as if they were animate (prosopopoeia).[126] While the citations indicate that by the time of writing the *Vita nuova* Dante had read texts by four of the major poets of antiquity, they reveal no more than superficial contact with the material.[127]

---

[125] *Vita nuova*, ed. Domenico de Robertis and Gianfranco Contini, in *Opere minori*, 3 vols. (Milan and Naples, 1995–96), 1:1:34. Albertus probably took it from the Latin translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, VII.1, 1145a, where the philosopher cites Homer, *Iliad*, XXIV, lines 258–59: "Nor seemed he to be the son of mortal men, but of a god." Dante simply changed the gender of the subject. The probable date for completion of the *Vita nuova* is given by Petrocchi, *Vita di Dante*, 31, n. 10.

[126] *Vita nuova*, 1.1:176–77 (XXV, 9): "Che li poete abbiano così parlato come detto è, appare per Virgilio; lo quale dice che Juno, cioè una dea nemica de li Troiani, parloe ad Eolo, segnore de li venti, quivi nel primo de lo Eneida: 'Eole, nanque tibi,' e che questo segnore le rispuose, quivi: 'Tuus, o regina, quid optes explorare labor; michi iussa capessere fas est.' Per questo medesimo poeta parla la cosa che non è animata a le cose animate, nel terzo de lo Eneida, quivi: 'Dardanide duri'. Per Lucano parla la cosa animata a la cosa inanimata, quivi: 'Multum, Roma, tamen debes civilibus armis'. Per Orazio parla l'uomo a la scienzia medesima sì come ad altra persona; e non solamente sono parole d'Orazio, ma dicele quasi recitando lo modo del buono Omero, quivi ne la sua Poetria: 'Dic michi, Musa, virum'. Per Ovidio parla Amore, sì come se fosse persona umana, ne lo principio de lo libro c'ha nome Libro di Remedio d'Amore, quivi: 'Bella michi, video, bella parantur, ait.'"

[127] This passage on prosopopoeia, however, parallels a standard one found in contemporary manuals of *ars poetrie* and *ars dictaminis*, in which the rhetorical figure is first defined and then illustrated by passages from ancient or biblical sources or both. See for comparison the section on prosopopoeia in Bene da Firenze's *Candelabrum*, ed. Gian Carlo Alessio (Padua, 1983), 217: "Quintum genus extendendi materiam est prosopopeia, id est informatio nove persone, que inter colores dicitur conformatio, iuxta illud:

> Nus ego iuncta vie cum sim crimine vite
> A populo saxis pretereunte petor. [Ovid, *Nux*, lines 1–2]

Similiter crux poterit introduci: 'Ego crux rapta conqueror de fidelium tarditate, quia non curant me de impiorum manibus liberare.'" Although Mattieu de Vendôme uses other examples, his fourfold division of the color is evocative of Dante's treatment: "Hic autem tropus quadripertito dividitur. Fit enim plerumque ab animato ad animatum, ab inanimato ad inanimatum, ab animato ad inanimatum, ab inanimato ad animatum": *Ars versificatoria*, in Edmond Faral, *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècles: Recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du moyen âge* (Paris, 1924), 172.

My first inclination was to think that Dante had taken these examples from one or more manuals, but an exhaustive search of the sources circulating in thirteenth-century Italy and possibly available to him – including a scattering of still unpublished manuals – failed to find anything that corresponded with the quotations that

That Virgil already had an attraction for Dante by the mid-1290s, however, is shown by his use of one of the ancient poet's stylistic trademarks, the extended simile, in the *Vita nuova*. In chapter 18, for example, he wrote:

> And then these women began to speak among themselves; and just as from time to time we see rain falling mixed with beautiful snow, so I seemed to hear their words uttered with a mixture of sighs.[128]

After that first appearance, the figure recurred repeatedly in his lyrical poetry. Almost absent from medieval literature, the simile returned to favor in Renaissance literature as a common rhetorical color, and part of its success must have derived from the ubiquity of extended similes in the *Commedia*. That the simile in its extended form made its first appearance in Dante's work as early as the *Vita nuova* suggests that, if only stylistically, Virgil was already exerting an influence.[129]

Dante gave. None used only ancient examples as he did, and when they gave such examples, none matched his. Subsequently, when Chistone's book, *La seconda fase*, 56–59, was brought to my attention by Dino Cervigni, I was surprised to find that Chistone too saw the likeness between the passage of the *Vita nuova* and the treatment of prosopopoeia or metaphor in contemporary manuals. Like me, however, he found nothing to corroborate the suspicion. Dante clearly cited the ancient authors in the passage as a way to legitimate his own use of prosopopoeia in the vernacular and, until evidence to the contrary is found, the assumption that he actually read the works cited cannot be refuted. I am grateful for the discussions I have had with Giuseppe Mazzotta, Richard Durling, and Dino Cervigni on this passage of Dante.

[128] *Vita nuova*, 111-12: "Allora queste donne cominciaro a parlare tra loro; e si come talora vedemo cadere l'acqua mischiata di bella neve, cosi mi parea udire le loro parole uscire mischiate di sospiri." A second simile is not extended enough to qualify as an example (ibid., 242): "Ne la terza dico quello che vide, cioè una donna onorata là suso; e chiamolo allora 'spirito peregrino', acciò che spiritualmente va là suso, e si come peregrino lo quale è fuori de la sua patria, vi stae." I am grateful to Dr. Umberto Taccheri for suggesting these two passages among a number of others in this work.

[129] Simile is defined as a figure of speech involving "a comparison of two things essentially unlike on the basis of a resemblance in one aspect": W.F. Thrall and A. Hibbard, *A Handbook of Literature*, rev. and enlarged by C.H. Holman (New York, 1960), 460. Although medieval authors of *ars poetrie* included the simile (*similitudo*, *comparatio*, *collatio*) in their discussion of rhetorical figures, poets of the twelfth and thirteenth century rarely used it: Farel, *Les arts poétiques*, 68–69; Hennig Brinkmann, *Zu Wesen und Form mittelalterlicher Dichtung*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1979), 49–50; and Leonid Arbusow, *Colores rhetorici: Eine Auswahl rhetorischen Figuren und Gemeinplätze als Hilfsmittel für akademische Übungen an mittelalterlichen Texten*, ed. H. Peter, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1948), 63–65.

In Dante's lyric poetry, no similes appear before 1296. For examples of similes beginning in 1296, see M. Barbi and V. Pernicone, *Dante Alighieri: Rime della maturità e dell'esilio*, *Opere di Dante*, vol. 3 (Florence, 1969). See poem 81, p. 406, lines 59–60;

Once exiled from Florence, Dante came into contact with the northern Italian world, where the new scholarship was thriving. Between June 1303 and March 1304, he was in Verona, and from the summer of 1304 to mid-1306 he moved around the Veneto, between Padua, Treviso, and Verona. His longest stay in the Veneto amounted to about six years, from mid-1312 to 1318. During his time in the small northern Italian cities, he probably came in contact either with Lovato or his disciples.[130] At some point as well, he surely met with Giovanni del Virgilio in Bologna. As a result of his wanderings, Dante not only had access to the north's rich library treasures, but also to the men who, thanks to their dedication to a classicizing aesthetic, were trying to unlock the secrets of ancient literature.

The *Convivio*, left unfinished in 1306/08, dramatically isolates the point at which Dante's passion for the ancient poets became overwhelming.[131] Not only did references to the ancient poets multiply as the work progressed, but in the last chapters written, beginning with IV.25, the character of the references themselves changed. Whereas up to that point the citations, given in Italian, had appeared starkly, without comments, now Dante began providing extensive summaries of ancient texts along with citations and expressing deep personal feeling for the poets themselves, especially Virgil.[132] For the first time, Dante drew material from the fifth and sixth books of the *Aeneid*, specifically in one place referring to the descent of Aeneas into Hell

---

poem 83, pp. 452–53, lines 92–101; poem 90, pp. 483–89, lines 1–19 and 26–30; and poem 101, pp. 556–57, lines 7–12. I have found no similes in the lyric poetry of Dante's contemporary, Guido Cavalcanti.

[130] Dante's knowledge of Seneca's tragedies suggests Paduan influence: E. Parodi, "Le tragedie di Seneca e la *Divina commedia*," *Bullettino società dantesca italiana*, n.s., 21 (1914), 241–52. Ezio Raimondi, "Dante e il mondo ezzeliniano," in *Dante e la cultura veneta* (Florence, 1966), 51–69, suggests that Dante knew of Mussato's *Ecerinis* and consciously contradicted the Paduan's theory of tragedy in his letter to Cangrande (69). On Dante's itinerary in the years of his exile, see Giorgio Petrocchi, "La vicenda biografica di Dante nel Veneto," *Itinerari danteschi* (Milan, 1994), 88–103.

[131] On the dating of the *Convivio* between 1303/04 and 1308, with the fourth treatise belonging to 1306/08, see discussion and bibliography in *Convivio*, in *Opere minori*, 2.1:xiv–xv.

[132] Ulrich Leo, "The Unfinished *Convivio* and Dante's Rereading of the *Aeneid*," *Mediaeval Studies* 13 (1951): 57–59. Chistoni devotes his *La seconda fase del pensiero dantesco* to arguing more generally that Dante's serious acquaintance with ancient literature began after the composition of the *Vita nuova*. Whereas Leo explains the new enthusiasm for Virgil and other Latin poets as stemming from a later "rereading" of the texts, I prefer to view it largely as the result of an initial or rapidly intensified study of their works.

(26.9).[133] He may well have broken off work on the *Convivio* because he was drawn irresistibly to the *Commedia*, wherein, with assistance from the ancients, he would seek to construct a poetic representation of all reality.

If Dante only began serious study of Virgil and other ancient poets after his exile in 1302, however, how are we to interpret his reference to his *lungo studio* in his first address to Virgil (*Inf.* 1.82–87)?

> O, glory and light of other poets, may the long study (*lungo studio*) and the great love that have made me search your volume avail me. You are my master and my author. You alone are he from whom I took the fair style that has done me honor.[134]

Whereas modern interpreters generally understand Dante as saying that he had been studying Virgil for many years, the earliest interpreter of these lines was not sure that this was their author's meaning. Referring to the *Commedia* in 1313–15, Francesco Barberino wrote:

> In one of his works which is entitled *Commedia*, in which among many things he treats of Hell, Dante d'Alighieri commends this poet [Virgil] as his master; and certainly, if someone would inspect this work with care, he would be able to see that Dante either studied this Virgil for a long time or made notable progress in his study in a short time.

In the phrase *lungo studio*, *lungo* could be a qualitative or quantitative term, and for Barberino the phrase was subject to two interpretations. In view of the foregoing evidence, his second is to be preferred: that Dante's *lungo studio* referred to an intensive, but relatively recent, focus on Virgil's writings.[135]

---

[133] Leo, "The Unfinished *Convivio*," 59–60.

[134] "O de li altri poeti onore e lume/ vagliami 'l lungo studio e 'l grande amore/ che m'ha fatto cercar lo tuo volume./ Tu se' lo mio maestro e 'l mio autore,/ tu se' solo colui da cu' io tolsi/ lo bello stilo che m'ha fatto onore." The translation is that of Charles S. Singleton, *Inferno*, vol. 1 of *Dante Alighieri: The Divine Comedy: Italian Text and Translation* (Princeton, 1970), 9.

[135] Of the two major positions on dating Dante's initiating the *Commedia*, whether in 1304 or 1306/07, see the summary of the arguments by A.E. Quaglio, "Commedia," in *Enciclopedia dantesca*, 2nd rev. ed., 5 vols. and append. (Rome, 1984), s. v. Quaglia notes (81b) that the later date is preferred. This would accord better with the interruption of the *Convivio* in 1306/08, the point at which Dante's enthusiasm for ancient poetry appeared to swell.

Francesco Barberino's statement, the earliest surviving reference to the *Commedia*, is as follows: "Hunc [Virgilium] Dante Arigherij in quodam suo opere quod dicitur comedia et de infernalibus inter cetera multa tractat, commendat protinus ut magistrum; et certe, si quis illud opus bene conspiciat videre poterit ipsum Dantem super ipsum Virgilium vel longo tempore studuisse, vel in parvo tempore plurimum

Begun perhaps about 1306–07, the *Commedia* reveals the increasing degree to which Dante expanded his classical learning, so that in the last year of his life, in an exchange of Latin poems with Giovanni del Virgilio, he demonstrated his capacity for composing poetry in classicizing Latin. Although the product of a uniquely creative imagination, the *Commedia* represented in one sense an effort to capture in Tuscan vernacular the stylistic principles of ancient poetry, especially those of Virgil, in a manner parallel to what Dante's Florentine contemporaries were learning to do in their prose translations of ancient works. With Virgil's help, Dante eschewed medieval abstraction, took from Virgil the realism of natural scenery, and freed himself from most of the rhetorical devices characteristic of medieval poetry, that is, the love of wordplay and the self-conscious indulgence in a panoply of rhetorical colors. In the frequent use of the extended simile, borrowed from Virgil and almost ignored by medieval writers, he made an exception. Nevertheless, the inspiration and conception of the work owed at least as much to medieval traditions as it did to northern Italian humanism.

Dante's revival of bucolic poetry was another matter. In 1319, sometime before September, Giovanni del Virgilio, a teacher of grammar in the Bolognese schools, who was apparently already acquainted with Dante, sent a metric missive to the Florentine poet at Ravenna, beseeching him to compose a poem in Latin, for learned men, dealing with a contemporary military exploit.[136] The laurel

---

profecisse": *I Documenti d'amore di Francesco da Barberino*, ed. Francesco Egidi, 4 vols. (Rome, 1905–27), 2:375–76. Citing these lines, Petrocchi, *Itinerari*, 69–71, maintains that by 1313–15 Barberino had not seen even the first canto of this work: otherwise he would not have been in doubt as to Dante's long study of Virgil. The comment of Barberino, however, clearly reflects the passage in *Inferno* 1, and his words "si qui illud opus bene conspiciat" indicate that he had held the manuscript in his hand. Consequently, in my opinion, Barberino was responding to what he considered the ambiguity of Dante's phrase "lungo studio."

The two earliest commentaries on the *Commedia*, those of Pietro d'Alighieri and the anonymous Ottimo, omit comment on this passage. The gloss in the later Trecento commentary of Benevenuto da Imola, *Commentum super Dantis Aldigherii Comoediam*, ed. G.F. Lacaita, 5 vols. (Florence, 1887), 1:51, remains unhelpful: "'vagliami il lungo studio,' idest longa inquisitio studiosa."

[136] For a summary of the dating of the poetic exchange, see Enzo Cechini's introduction, *Opere minori*, 3 vols. (Milan and Naples, 1995-96), 3.2:648–49. The first poem of del Virgilio is found ibid., 652–60. The poetry is found in Boccaccio's famous *zibaldone* in the Laurentian Library (Plut. XXIX, 8, fols. 65–70v). The manuscript is analyzed by Anna M. Cesari, "Presentazione del codice laurenziano *Plut.* xxix, 8," *Archivio storico lombardo* 100 (1973): 434–77. On the authenticity of the corre-

crown awaited him on completion of such a work, and Giovanni himself volunteered to bestow it in Bologna. The crowning of Mussato in Padua four years earlier for the *Historia augusta* and the *Ecerinis* was the precedent.

Within the year, Dante replied, not, however, with the requested epic, but in a humorous vein, with a "humble" (the word is Dante's) bucolic. Dante began in pastoral code:

> Vidimus in nigris albo patiente lituris
> Pierio demulsa sinu modulamina nobis.[137]

He could not come to Bologna for fear of his personal safety, but in any case he hoped on the completion of his *Commedia* to receive the poet's crown in his native city for that work. He realized Giovanni's scorn of the vernacular:

> Comica nonne vides ipsum reprehendere verba tum quia femineo resonant ut trita labello tum quia Castalias pudet acceptare sorores?[138]

In expectation that he might change Giovanni's mind, he intended to send him ten cantos of his *Paradiso*.

In Giovanni's reply, written later in the same year, he explained that, inspired by Dante's revival of the bucolic cipher, he too would "sing as a herdsman in the woodlands":

> Nec mora depositis calamis majoribus inter arripio tenues et labris flantibus hisco.[139]

Were Dante willing to come, he could do so safely and Giovanni and his wife would welcome him as best as their limited means allowed. Moreover, if that was not enticement enough, Giovanni could also promise Dante that he would see Mussato, who was expected to be in Bologna.[140]

---

spondence, see the bibliography provided by Cesari, 453–54, n. 39. Contemporary scholarly opinion generally accepts the correspondence as genuine.

[137] *Egl.* 2, lines 1–2, in *Opere minori*, 3.2:662: "In black letters imposed against a white background, I see a song milked for me from a Pierian breast."

[138] Ibid., lines 52–54, p. 668: "Do you not see that he blames the words of comedy, because they sound so trite on women's lips, and the Castalian sisters are ashamed to accept them?"

[139] *Egl.*, 3, lines 31–32, in *Opere minori*, 3.2:676: "And without more delay, casting the greater reeds aside, I seize the slender ones and part my lips to blow."

[140] We have no assurance that Dante already knew Mussato. We can say only that Giovanni's letter indicates that he at least *thought* that Mussato's presence would be a drawing card.

Dante's second bucolic letter, probably written the following year, may have been sent only after his death. Less inspired than the first, it may have been completed by his literary heirs. In the letter, Dante reassured his various friends, anxious for him to accept Giovanni's invitation, that he would not desert them. He would be willing to leave

> ... herba
> Trinacride montis, quo non fecundius alter
> Montibus in Siculis pecudes armentaque pavit

at the call of Mopsus (Giovanni), but he could not visit him for fear of his life.[141] Thus, he would not desert "the dewy country of Pelorus" (line 46).

Dante's bucolic poetry is perhaps the best evidence of the mature Florentine poet's receptivity to the new humanist influence abroad in Bologna and in the Veneto and of the continued vitality of his creative impulses down to the end of his life. While counterfactual speculations are no more than thought experiments, I think it safe to say that had Dante remained in Florence rather than gone into exile, these Latin poems, written in a classicizing style, would never have been written. The case of the *Commedia* is different. Had Dante not been forced through exile to dwell for long periods of time in areas newly alive to the charm of the ancient Latin language and abounding in manuscripts of the great pagan authors, he might still have written a *Commedia* – Charles Davis has shown us that the education in theology and natural science was available in late-thirteenth-century Florence to provide him with much of the structure and some of the content of the poem. In all likelihood, though, it would have been far less rich both in style and content than the masterpiece that Dante produced in exile.[142]

---

[141] *Egl.*, 4, lines 70–72, in *Opere minori*, 3.2:686: "... the grasses of the Trinacrian mount [Ravenna], than which no other Sicilian mountain has nourished flocks and herds more richly."

[142] Giuseppe Billanovich has emphasized the cultural differences between Florence and Padua in his many articles. After surveying Remigio Sabbadini's account of the revival of ancient letters in his *Scoperte*, Billanovich writes in his "Tra Dante e Petrarca," *IMU* 8 (1965): 2–3: "... dobbiamo concludere che quella Firenze, dove non ci riesce di trovare né un grammatico acuto, né un codice classico monumentale – e che infatti politicamente, culturalmente e artisticamente fu creatura più giovane delle vicine Lucca, Pisa e Arezzo – , non conobbe una filologia pari a quella dei Veneti, nè a quella, molto più tenue, di Geri d'Arezzo." In his brief reference to Dante's bucolic poetry, Billanovich puzzles over where the poet could have gotten

It is true that a city of Florence's size and wealth had frequent communication with centers where humanists were active. In 1309, Mussato served as Florence's Executor of Justice, and he returned ten years later on a mission for Padua. Guizzardo da Bologna, who with Castellano da Bassano had commented on Mussato's *Ecerinis*, taught literature in Florence between 1321 and 1322. Judging by his correspondence with Florentines, Geri d'Arezzo must have spent at least some time in the city. But brief periods of residence by foreign humanist scholars such as Geri and Mussato were not enough to initiate a reorientation of Florentine literary tastes.

8

Tuscany did have a scholar worthy of comparison with Mussato, however, in the person of Geri di ser Federigi of Arezzo. Writing to Bartolomeo Oliari, cardinal of Padua, in 1395, Coluccio Salutati, chancellor of Florence and the leading humanist of his generation, praised Geri as the greatest imitator of his day of Pliny the Younger and paired him with Mussato as "the first cultivator of eloquence" after centuries of rhetorical decline. Five years later, in a letter to another Paduan, Francesco Zabarella, Salutati again identified Mussato and Geri as "famed for style and eloquence": Mussato for poetry and histories; Geri for poetry, letters, and prose satires.[143] Not only Salutati but two older humanists, Benvenuto da Imola and Lapo

---

his training in Florence: "Allora Dante si rivela esperto di prosodia e di metrica latina: che dunque deve avere appreso adolescente in una scuola decorosa, tanto più che dettare esametri non fu di moda a Firenze tra Brunetto Latini e Guido Cavalcanti ...." (17). Consequently, while he cannot explain who would have taught Dante, Billanovich suggests that already before his exile Dante had the grounding in ancient poetic literature that he would later demonstrate in the *Commedia*.

Like Billanovich, Gianfranco Folena, *Cultura e lingue nel Veneto medievale* (Padua, 1990), 301–02, discounts northern Italian influence on Dante when he maintains: "Le cure del protoumanesimo padovano non toccano Dante, anche se lo sfiorano infine nella corrispondenza poetica con uno degli epigoni di quella cerchia padovana, il maestro Giovanni del Virgilio ...." First of all, the successful resurrection of a hitherto neglected genre of ancient poetry seems to me to reflect more than a mere "grazing." But more than this, I argue that the body of Dante's classical learning came to him after 1302.

[143] Salutati's comments on Geri are published by Roberto Weiss, *Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo* (Rome, 1949), 106–07. Cf. idem, "Lineamenti per una storia del primo umanesimo fiorentino," *Rivista storica italiana* 60 (1948): 359.

da Castiglionchio, refer to Geri's letter collection, at least one copy of which was in the Visconti library in Pavia in the second quarter of the fifteenth century (whence it subsequently disappeared).[144] Unfortunately, only fragments of what must have been a large corpus of writings survive down to our time: a metric epistle; a dialogue between Geri and *Amor* dedicated to the Florentine lawyer and writer, Francesco da Barberino; and six prose letters, of which five are personal and the sixth official.[145] Perhaps his writings enjoyed only limited circulation. That the three scholars who praised him two generations later came from the Bolognese–Florentine area is consistent with that speculation.

Born about 1270 in the university center of Tuscany, Geri claimed to have read Terence as a young man. If he studied the author as a school text, that raises the possibility that his own teacher had already been touched by new scholarly aspirations.[146] After obtaining a degree in civil law in an unidentified *studio*, he probably spent most of his life alternately teaching civil law and serving in high positions on the staffs of *podestà* in various cities. We know that late in 1327, during the time when Charles of Anjou was acting as the elected

[144] Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 108.

[145] Weiss, ibid., 109–32, publishes these remnants.

[146] Ibid., 128. A list of books owned by a fourteenth-century Aretine notary, ser Simone di ser Benvenuto di Bonaventura della Tenca, contains a copy of Terence: U. Pasqui, "La biblioteca d'un notaro aretino del secolo XIV," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 4 (1889): 253. In a contract of 1322, ser Simone, who died in 1338, is referred to as *sapiens et discretus vir magister*, which suggests that he was also a professor of grammar (251, n. 2).

The major modern study of Arezzo as a center of learning is Helene Wieruszowski, "Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century," in her *Politics and Culture*, 387–474. Implying a continuous tradition of the study of the classics from the twelfth into the thirteenth century – which remains to be proven – Wieruszowski, 423, argues that, while pushed into the background by professional and practical interests, the study of the ancients "persisted" in the thirteenth century because "Guittone (born ca. 1225) and the humanist Geri (born ca. 1260), both reared in Arezzo, were introduced to ancient authors in their grammar school days." While I have suggested that there is good evidence that Geri might have received such training in grammar school, I am dubious about Guittone, who belonged to the previous generation. Wieruszowski herself writes (458) that Guittone might have used medieval manuals for his references to classical authors. Robert Black, *Studio e scuola in Arezzo durante il Medioevo e il Rinascimento: I documenti d'archivio fino al 1530* (Arezzo, 1996), 108, cites these passages of Wieruszowski's as evidence that the pagan authors were studied in Arretine grammar schools in the thirteenth century.

signore of Florence (1326–27), Geri was chosen to be the next *avocatus* of the Florentine commune, but because of Charles's death, we cannot be sure that he exercised the office.[147] Geri apparently died before December 1337, when an Aretine document referred to his son Giovanni as *ser Johannes olim domini Geri de Aretio*.[148]

The prose letters provide at least one motive for Salutati's high assessment of Geri's role in the foundation of the new studies. In singling out Geri's imitation of Pliny the Younger, Salutati obviously intended to draw attention to Geri's contribution to epistolography: his five surviving personal letters constitute the earliest examples of classicizing epistolary prose.[149] To classicize the letter, for centuries the domain of *ars dictaminis*, was a bold act. Mussato pioneered in the classicizing of prose generally when he imitated Livy in his historical writings, but of his two surviving prose letters, one was written in *dictamen* and the other in an awkward blend of *dictamen* and his new historical prose.[150]

By his own official letter in *ars dictaminis* form, Geri demonstrates his recognition of the futility of pushing innovation too far. His personal letters, however, are obvious efforts on his part to regain for the prose epistle the characteristics of charm, intimacy, and personal expression that he found in ancient correspondence. With Geri began the century-long humanist practice of using two styles, depending on whether a letter was considered personal or official. While Geri frequently cited Pliny the Younger, he quoted other ancient authors like Seneca and Juvenal with equal frequency, and it is difficult to detect in his style a specific imitation of Pliny's correspondence. His allusion in one letter to the two Plinys points to contact with Veronese humanism and particularly the *Brevis adnotatio de duobus*

[147] Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 105; and idem, "Lineamenti," 58, makes this assumption, but no trace of Geri's presence in official acts of 1328 has been found. Weiss suggests that Geri was a member of the entourage of the Duke of Calabria in Florence and in this way came to know Barbato da Sulmona, Giovanni Barrili, and Nicola d'Alife, the three principal promoters of humanism at the court of Robert I, who were admirers of Petrarch (ibid., 64–65).

[148] Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 106: "ser Johannes of the late lord Geri d'Arezzo."

[149] These letters are found in Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 109–15 and 118–25. Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:84, refers to Geri as "maximus Plinii Secundi oratoris ... imitator." In a later letter, Salutati refers to Geri's pioneering role in humanism and mentions his "versus et epistolas satirasque prosaicas," which have since disappeared (3:410).

[150] The existing letters of Geri all seem to be from his maturity.

Pliniis (1320/28) of Giovanni de Matociis.[151] Certainly his citation of hitherto rare Latin authors such as Apuleius and Pliny put him in the literary avant-garde. His treatment of *amor* in the dialogue dedicated to Francesco Barberino reverberated with Ovidian echoes and lacked any hint of contemporary chivalric associations.[152]

Geri's letters show him in correspondence with a small group of aspiring local writers, some of whom were Florentine, such as the vernacular poet, Gherardo da Castelfiorentino, and the lawyers, Cambio da Poggibonsi and Francesco da Barberino. Gherardo and Geri must have shared a common interest in ancient authors, because together with a letter comparing ancient greatness with modern mediocrity, Geri sent his Florentine correspondent a precious manuscript of Caesar's *De bello gallico*, presumably so that Gherardo could make a copy for himself.[153] Of the correspondence of Geri with Cambio, only one letter of Cambio's in dactylic hexameter and two letters of Geri's, one in prose and the other in metric, survive.[154] Too little is known of the lives and works of Gherardo or Cambio to permit a judgment on the extent of their humanistic interests.[155]

By contrast, Geri's third Florentine friend, Francesco da Barberino, the leading literary figure of the city down to the 1330s, is well-known. Barberino's blending of Latin scholarship with vernacular writing probably typifies the scholarly use of ancient texts in Florence in those decades. A lawyer by profession, Barberino borrowed from ser Brunetto the desire to "degrossare" (civilize) his fellow Florentines, but in his case the models derived from medieval Provençal and French sources. Barberino's most scholarly work, *Documenti d'amore*, was essentially a book of manners in Tuscan verse, accompanied in several manuscripts with a Latin translation of the poem and an extensive Latin commentary on it.

---

[151] Weiss, "Lineamenti," 359. Geri also identified the *De bello gallico* as authored by Caesar, a fact unknown to Petrarch (ibid., 358–59). Geri's exchange of metric epistles with Cambio da Poggibonsi on the value of having children may have been inspired by the similar debate between Lovato and Mussato.

[152] Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 126–32.

[153] See Weiss, "Lineamenti," 360, for bibliography. Geri's letter to Gherardo is published in *Il primo secolo*, 120–21. Geri's high esteem for Caesar deserves to be noted in the light of the identification of Caesar with tyranny by the civic humanists of the early fifteenth century.

[154] Weiss, *Il primo secolo*, 112–19.

[155] Geri also wrote a letter to Donato Guadagni, presumably a young Florentine boy, encouraging him in his studies (ibid., 110–11), but nothing of the boy is otherwise known.

Born about 1264, Barberino appears to have spent an extended period of time outside Florence in his thirties and early forties. He was in France for most of the period from 1304 to 1313, when he returned to Italy.[156] It would appear from evidence internal to the *Documenti* that he began to collect material for the work beginning about 1296 or 1297, started writing the poem shortly before leaving Italy, and finished the Latin commentary in Bologna after his return from France and before returning to Florence in 1315.[157]

His frequent references to French and Provençal authors, some of them otherwise unknown to modern scholars, indicate the extent to which he had absorbed northern culture during his travels. It may have been in France that he had occasion to read a number of the less well-known classical texts that he quoted in his long commentary, works such as Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, Apuleius's *De deo Socratis*, Gellius's *Noctes atticae*, and Seneca's *Tragediae*. His citations from Church fathers, ancient and medieval medical texts, and the new travel literature on the Orient, such as the work of Plano di Carpini, testify to the broad range of his reading.

Barberino's use of the wide array of material lacked originality, however. Basically the authors cited served as authorities to underwrite rules of comportment inspired by French society, which he obviously wanted to offer as a model for the Florentine patriciate. His employment of ancient sources directed to this specific goal gave no indication of an appreciation of context, and his Latin lacked any classicizing resonance. To the extent that Barberino reflects the scholarly life of early-fourteenth-century Florence, he demonstrates how strongly the medieval orientation toward the ancients persisted in the city.

---

[156] *I documenti d'amore*, 4:xli, provides dates for the composition. Barberino's date of departure from Florence is given by A. Thomas, *Francesco da Barberino et la littérature provençale en Italie* (Paris, 1883), 32. For chronology of his time in France, see Francesco Mazzoni, "Per Francesco da Barberino," *Miscellanea storica della Valdelsa* 70 (1964): 179 and 184. As a student of law in Padua, he doubtless would have had some contact with the scholarly activity there: Weiss, "Lineamenti," 57. Egidi considers the work completed at Mantua in 1313: F. Egidi, "Per la datazione della Divina Commedia," *La Rassegna* 37 (1929): 250–55. G. Vandelli, "Ancora sulla datazione della Commedia," *Studi danteschi* 15 (1931): 43–53, argues for 1313 or 1314 and places Barberino in Bologna at the time Barberino finished the manuscript. Petrocchi, *Itinerari*, 66, considers it completed in 1314–15, before Barberino's recall to Florence, and agrees with Vandelli on Bologna.

[157] Mazzoni, "Per Francesco da Barberino," 186.

Only in the late 1340s, with Giovanni Boccaccio, Lapo da Castiglionchio, Zanobi da Strada, Francesco Bruni, Bruno Casini, and Francesco Nelli, did signs of the new aesthetic at work in Florence emerge. By that decade, through the mediation of Senuccio del Bene, Petrarch already stood out as a model for their studies and it is impossible to say to what extent the scholarly and literary work of the others reflected independent initiative and to what extent Petrarch's influence.[158]

The precociousness of vernacular literature in Florence, which was directly related to a widespread vernacular literacy, in the short run hindered the development of humanism in Florence. In the long run, however, while lacking the effect of direct contact with the ancient Latin, the vernacular served as a vehicle for diffusing knowledge of ancient literature and culture to a public significantly larger than that reached by the elitist movement of the mainland Veneto cities and Bologna. When humanism belatedly took root in Florence from the mid-fourteenth century, consequently, a popular awareness of the value of pagan writing provided a basis for patronage and support of the movement and ultimately led – at least as far as the upper classes of the city were concerned – to a new program of education.

[158] Giuseppe Billanovich and C. Scarpati, "Da Dante al Petrarca e dal Petrarca al Boccaccio," *Il Boccaccio nelle culture e letterature nazionali*, ed. F. Mazzoni (Florence, 1978), 583–604, assign the key role of mediator between Petrarch and the Florentine intelligensia to Senuccio.

CHAPTER SIX

PETRARCH, FATHER OF HUMANISM?

Petrarch would have been pleased by modern scholarship's endorsement of the reputation that he tried to create for himself. In what is perhaps his first surviving prose writing, his *Collatio laureationis*, written for the Capitoline ceremony conferring on him the laureate in 1341, Petrarch boasted of having taken the lead in striking out on a new course:

> I have not been afraid to furnish leadership on such a trying and, to me, even dangerous path, and many, I think, are ready to follow after me.[1]

Nor was Petrarch reluctant late in life to accept the judgment of Boccaccio, his most ardent admirer, who considered him the founder of the new studies.[2] Salutati, who recognized Mussato and Geri as the true pioneers, may have known better, but the immense figure of Petrarch cast such a shadow across the legacies of his predecessors that the generation after Salutati readily ascribed to Boccaccio's assertion, which Bruni enshrined in his *Vita del Petrarca*.[3]

At the time of his coronation on the Capitoline, Petrarch could speak freely. He had no rivals. Mussato, along with Geri and

---

[1] "Me in tam laborioso et michi quidem periculoso calle ducem prebere non expavi, multis [multos MS] posthac, ut arbitror, secuturis ....": C. Godi, "La *Collatio laureationis* del Petrarca nelle due redazioni," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 5 (1988): 1–58, as well as comments by M. Feo, "Note petrarchesche," *Quaderni petrarcheschi* 7 (1990): 186–203. The passage is cited from Sylvia Rizzo, "Il latino del Petrarca e il latino dell'umanesimo," in *Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell'umanesimo: Atti del convegno internazionale, Firenze 19–22 Maggio 1991*, *Quaderni petrarcheschi* 9–10 (1992–93): 351. Rizzo was the first to point out this important passage, indicative of Petrarch's self-representation at an early date in his life. On the speech itself, see ibid., n. 6.

[2] *Seniles*, bk. XVII, letter 2; in Petrarch, *Prose*, 1144. Cited in Rizzo, "Il latino del Petrarca," 350. Petrarch refers to himself as "omnium senior qui nunc apud nos his in studiis elaborant." A modern edition of the *Seniles* is in progress. At the time of writing, it consists of bk. 1: *Le senili*, ed. E. Nota (Rome, 1993). Wherever possible, I have tried to use this edition or modern editions of individual letters. Otherwise, I refer to the Basel edition of the *Opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Basel, 1554). An English translation of the *Seniles* has been published by A. Bernardo, S. Levin, and R.A. Bernardo, *Letters of Old Age (Rerum senilium libri I–XVIII)*, 2 vols. (Baltimore, 1992).

[3] For the influence of Boccaccio on Bruni's assessment, cf. Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, 2nd ed., (Princeton, 1966), 254–69.

Giovanni del Virgilio, were dead, and no one of comparable stature had stepped forward to claim the inheritance. I have no intention of denying the fundamental importance of Petrarch's contribution to Italian humanism: in many respects the title "founder" is appropriate for him. Not only did his compelling writings, dramatized by a life lived self-consciously, serve to create, at least temporarily, an international movement and to win broad respect for humanistic endeavors among the powerful, but they also provided humanists with a clear conception of the purpose of their enterprise. Although certainly convinced of the relevance of ancient literature and history for their own world, neither Lovato nor Mussato nor any other scholar in their two generations appears to have formulated a general statement of the goal of the new scholarship. My aim in this chapter is to situate Petrarch historically as the principal successor of two generations of scholarly and literary work. I argue that Petrarch's Christian humanism represented a redefinition of what had so far been basically a secular movement. While Petrarch's influence dominated, humanism appealed to the tastes of northern Europeans as well as Italians; as his influence diminished and secular tendencies reasserted themselves, humanism's adherents beyond the Alps, never numerous, dropped away.

1

That Francesco Petrarch came to maturity at Avignon in France and not in Italy had immense consequences for the history of Italian humanism. The first Italian humanist to have no direct experience of communal life, he was also the first major figure to be a cleric. Despite his later attacks on the venality and impiety of Avignon, Petrarch grew up in contact with deeply religious individuals who aroused in him an active commitment to the Christian life. Avignon was the intellectual crossroads of the cultural life of Europe, and there the young man also had access to a range of ideas and a wealth of manuscripts unavailable elsewhere. Supported by the patronage of the Colonna family at Avignon, he was able to make the most of the opportunities.

Petrarch generously recognized the role of his father in arousing his passion for antiquity. Exiled from Florence in 1302 along with Dante, ser Petracco, Petrarch tells us, felt an emotional kinship with

his fellow exile based on their common troubles and their similar scholarly and intellectual interests. Whereas ser Petracco abandoned his commitment to letters because of his concern for his family, however, Dante "began devoting himself all the more vigorously to his literary pursuits, neglecting all else and desirous only of glory."[4] What Petrarch does not say of his father is that, after coming to Avignon, he resumed his interest in ancient literature late in life, doubtless with his brilliant elder son's encouragement. About 1325, in a collaborative effort, son and father produced the *Ambrosian Virgil*, "the first great fruit of the engrafting of philology into rhetoric."[5] The task of producing such a manuscript could not have been accomplished in contemporary Florence, which lacked a rich collection of texts.

Whereas Dante and ser Petracco had had a cosmopolitan experience only in maturity, Petrarch never really had a homeland. Born in exile at Arezzo in 1304, at the age of eight he went with his family to Avignon, where his father found work at the papal curia. Because of crowded conditions in Avignon, his father located the family at Carpentras, fifteen miles from the papal court, and it was there that Petrarch spent the next four years of his life. In 1316 he was sent to study law at Montpellier, and then in autumn 1320 he left Avignon to continue his legal studies at Bologna, accompanied by his younger brother, Gherardo, and a tutor. Although he returned frequently to Avignon, he spent most of the next six years in Italy.

From early childhood, Petrarch was drawn to the music of ancient Latin. "When everyone else was poring over Prosper or Aesop," he wrote in *Seniles* XVI.1,

> I brooded over Cicero's books, whether through natural instinct or the urgings of my father, a great admirer of that author .... At that age, of course, I could understand nothing; only a certain sweetness and tune-

[4] Petrarch, *Rerum familiarium*, bk. IV, letter 21, in *Familiari* 4:95 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 3:302 (English). For ser Petracco's career as a notary in Florence before his exile, see Paolo Viti, "Ser Petracco, padre del Petrarca, notaio dell'età di Dante," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 2 (1985): 1–14.

[5] The phrase is that of Giuseppe Billanovich: "Il Virgilio del Petrarca da Avignone a Milano," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 2 (1985): 28. For Petrarch's biography, consult especially E.H. Wilkins, *The Life of Petrarch* (Chicago and London, 1961); and Ugo Dotti, *Vita di Petrarca* (Rome and Bari, 1987). Essays in A. Foresti, *Aneddoti della vita di Francesco Petrarca* (Brescia, 1928; 2nd ed., ed. A. Tissoni Benvenuti, Padua, 1977), can still be read with profit.

> fulness of the words so held me that everything else I either read or heard seemed to me coarse and extremely unmusical.[6]

Ser Petracco eagerly followed and encouraged his precocious son's predilections, but his curial duties kept him away from home for long periods. Petrarch needed continuity in his education; consequently, his training was placed in the hands of another Tuscan exile, Convenevole da Prato, with whom he studied for four years, between 1312 and 1316.

Nothing survives of ser Petracco's writings to show whether his scholarship ever led him to create a classicizing style in prose or poetry. The same is true for his friend, ser Simone d'Arezzo, another learned Italian at Avignon.[7] When, as in the cases of Landolfo Colonna and his nephew Giovanni, we can compare the devotion to scholarship of learned Italians at Avignon with their actual writings, we find that their passion for philological research far exceeded any concern for stylistics.[8] The extant literary work of Petrarch's Tuscan schoolmaster, Convenevole, suggests that the spirit of the ancient writers had eluded him as well. In 1383, two generations after Convenevole's death, Filippo Villani characterized him as "a man indifferently skilled in poetry."[9] While Petrarch himself in later life spoke warmly of his first teacher, he intimated that even as a boy in Convenevole's classroom he felt himself superior to his master. To judge from his letter to Philippe, Bishop of Cavillon, written as an introduction to *Rerum familiarium* XXIV, Petrarch at eleven or twelve was reading Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal in the classroom.

Convenevole's understanding of the texts, however, was apparently superficial, as far as his brilliant student was concerned:

---

[6] *Seniles* XVI.1 (XV.1), in *Opera*, 2:1046–47. Although the letter is commonly considered the opening letter of bk. XVI, the Basel edition of Petrarch's works publishes it as a part of bk. XV.

[7] Ser Simone's career is discussed by L. Muttoni, "Simone d'Arezzo canonico a Verona," *IMU* 22 (1979): 171–207; and Claudia Adami, "Il beneficio veronese di Simone d'Arezzo," ibid., 208–22. Giuseppe Billanovich, "Il Virgilio del Petrarca," 22 and 33, emphasizes the participation of ser Simone in the Avignon group of scholars to which ser Petracco and Petrarch himself belonged.

[8] For the biography of Landolfo, see Massimo Miglio, "Colonna, Landolfo," in *DBI* 27 (Rome, 1982), 349–52; for that of Giovanni, see Francesco Surdich, "Colonna, Giovanni," in ibid., 337–38.

[9] Filippo Villani, *De origine civitatis Florentie et de eiusdem famosis civibus*, ed. Giuliani Tanturli (Padua, 1997), 90. Villani describes him as "viro mediocris poesis perito."

> These and similar things I would read, admiring not only the grammar and skillful use of words, as is customary at that age, but perceiving a hidden meaning in the words unnoticed by my fellow students or even by my teacher, learned though he was in the elements of the arts.[10]

In the very last years of his life (1373–74), Petrarch discussed his lifelong relationship with Convenevole in some detail and commented particularly on Convenevole's inability to focus on one writing project at a time. Convenevole's sole surviving work, *Regia carmina*, strikingly illustrates this observation.[11] Purportedly composed in honor of Robert of Anjou over a fifteen-year period, the work is a vast farrago containing a few short pieces in prose and consisting for the most part of 105 compositions in verse, of which two are in elegiac couplets, sixteen in various other meters, and eighty-seven in hexameter. Many of the hexameter compositions are interspersed with lines in other verse forms.[12] Convenevole shows a preference for leonine rhyme, which features rhymes between hemistiches or between internal or final words of two successive lines.[13] Accent clearly has primacy over quantity, and Convenevole occasionally sacrifices grammatical correctness to achieve his rhyme scheme. The poems, many on subjects having nothing to do with Robert, are character-

[10] *Rerum fam.* XXIV.1, in *Familiari* 4:214 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 3:308–09 (English). The references to Convenevole are taken from Emilio Pasquini, "Convenevole da Prato," in *DBI* 28 (Rome, 1983), 563–64, with bibliography. See now also Giuseppe Billanovich, "Ser Convenevole maestro notaio e clerico," in *Petrarca, Verona e l'Europa: Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Verona, 19–23 sett. 1991*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich and Giuseppe Frasso (Padua, 1997), 366–90, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 26. It is impossible to know whether Convenevole would have followed the same curriculum had he remained in Prato and not been largely teaching French boys. Although a cleric, Convenevole seems to have been sceptical in religious matters. In the *De otio*, Petrarch, referring to his formal education, says of his masters, among them probably Convenevole: "qui psalterium daviticum qua nulla pregnantior scriptura est, et omnem divine textum pagine non aliter quam aniles fabulas irriderent": *Il De otio religioso di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. G. Rotondi (Vatican City, 1958), 103. Cf. Giuseppe Billanovich, "Ser Convenevole," 369.

[11] Petrarch writes in *Sen.* XVI.1 (XV.1), in *Opera*, 2:1049: "Quotidie enim libros inchoabat, mirabilium inscriptionum, et proemio consumato, quod in libro primum, in inventione ultimum esse solet, ad opus aliud phantasiam instabilem transferebat." The *Regia carmina* is published as *Regia carmina dedicati a Roberto d'Angiò re di Sicilia e di Gerusalemme*, ed. and trans. Cesare Grassi, with essays by Marco Ciatti and Aldo Petri, 2 vols. (Milan, 1982).

[12] Convenevole's authorship is a matter of debate, but Grassi's arguments for the attribution are convincing: *Regia carmina*, 8–9. An analysis of the language and style of the work is found in ibid., 9–11.

[13] On leonine verse, see above, 66, n. 81.

ized by frequent wordplay and, in accord with medieval taste, generous use of rhetorical colors.

Whether the young Petrarch had any contact with the works of contemporary authors like Lovato and Mussato, which might have given him an idea of the possibilities for writing classicizing Latin poetry, is uncertain.[14] But at least by the second decade of the fourteenth century, Cardinal Niccolò da Prato and Simone d'Arezzo, both probably close to ser Petracco, were in contact with Mussato and Rolando da Piazzola.[15] If the Paduans' writings were circulating at Avignon, Petrarch, already as a teenager enthusiastic about writing Latin poetry, would doubtless have read them.

Petrarch's first surviving work, an elegy composed at fifteen on the death of his mother, Elena Canigiani, reveals the young man grappling with rendering his sorrow into classically correct Latin verse. Given Petrarch's usual practice, the piece may well have been edited years later before its inclusion at the end of *Epist. met.* 1.6, but the *Breve pangerycum defuncte matri* appears to be an authentic early work.[16] The language represents a mix between the liturgical Latin of hagiography and the Latin of classical models. Excessively discursive, the poem fails to distill the poet's emotions into effective imagery, but at the same time it reflects a different aesthetic from that of the *Regia carmina.* Despite the passion for book collecting common in the curia and the philological bent of men like Simone d'Arezzo and Petrarch's own father, there is no evidence that anyone at Avignon besides the fifteen-year-old Petrarch was striving to transform the new approach to scholarship into a means of self-expression. Even before coming to Italy to witness the new stylistic movement firsthand, he had enlisted in the humanist cause.

---

[14] Giuseppe Billanovich, "Tra Dante e Petrarca," *IMU* 8 (1965): 8–10, interprets Cardinal Niccolò da Prato's commission to Nicholas Trevet (ca. 1314) for a commentary on Seneca as a direct result of the contact of the cardinal and his client, ser Simone d'Arezzo, with Mussato and Rolando da Piazzola at the court of Emperor Henry VII a few years earlier. Billanovich also considers the papal commission to Trevet for a commentary on Livy to have been inspired by the cardinal, eager to understand two of the authors dear to the Paduans (10–11). See also Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell'Umanesimo*, 2 vols. in 3, Studi sul Petrarca, nos. 9 and 11 (Padua, 1981), 1:45–46.

[15] *Sen.* XVI.1 (XV.1), in *Opera*, 2:1049; *Letters of Old Age*, 2:605, tells us that as a boy he was dear to the cardinal out of the latter's respect for his father.

[16] For the text of the poem, see Elena Giannarelli, "Fra mondo classico e agiografia cristiana: il *Breve pangerycum defuncte matris* di Petrarca," *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa*, 3rd ser., 9 (1979): 1099–1118.

Petrarch studied in Bologna from 1320 to 1326, but his studies were interrupted by extensive periods of travel and several long stays in Avignon. As in France, no solid evidence exists for Petrarch having had contact at Bologna with the work of earlier Italian humanists. Only by the mid-1340s, in fact, when he praised Lovato as a poet and Mussato as a historian in his uncompleted encyclopedic *Rerum memorandarum libri*, can we be certain that he knew their writings.[17] Petrarch was always reluctant to cite medieval and recent authors; that he mentioned Lovato and Mussato by name shows a high degree of respect for their achievements. Although indirectly, he praised them again in a contemporary metric poem, *Epist. met.* II.10, line 69, when he exclaimed:

> What great offspring the city of the sons of Antenor have celebrated![18]

Petrarch would almost certainly have known of the exchange of bucolic poetry between Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio, which must have been circulating in Bologna in 1320 and 1321.[19] Because Petrarch joined the exodus of masters and students from Bologna in the spring or summer of 1321 in protest against a student's execution by the communal government, he could not have made the acquaintance, however, of Rolando da Piazzola, a nephew of Lovato and a scholar in his own right, who served as vicar of the *podestà* of Bologna in the first half of 1322.[20] But during his years in Bologna did Petrarch's passion for literary studies lead him to the classroom of Giovanni del Virgilio himself?[21]

---

[17] *Rerum memorandarum libri*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich, Edizione nazionale delle opere di Petrarca, no. 14 (Florence, 1943), II.6, p. 84; IV.118, p. 270. Also on Lovato, see above, 87.

[18] Petrarch, *Opera*, 2:1350b: "Urbs Antenoridum quantos celebravit alumnos." Petrarch seems to have known Mussato's *De lite* and *Contra casus* at least by 1349. See Francesco Lo Monaco, "Un nuovo testimonio (frammentario) del *Contra casus fortuitos* di Albertino Mussato," *IMU* 28 (1985): 110. Fleeing the destruction of his city, the Trojan Antenor, according to legend, founded Padua.

[19] On the dates, see the observations of G. Lidonnici, "Polifemo," *Bullettino della Società dantesca italiana*, n.s., 18 (1911): 204, and his "La corrispondenza poetica di Giovanni del Virgilio con Dante e il Mussato, e le postille di Giovanni Boccaccio," *Giornale dantesco*, n.s., 21 (1913): 232–33.

[20] Gian C. Alessio, "I trattati grammaticali di Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 24 (1981): 161.

[21] Petrarch's *Sen.* XVI.1 (XV.1), in *Opera omnia*, 2:1047, implies that as a very young man, he was himself interested in becoming a lawyer out of hope of gain: "Sic coepto in studio, nullis externis egens stimulis, procedebam, donec victrix industriae cupiditas, jure civilis, ad studium me detrusit." It is clear, however, that already

The chronology of del Virgilio's life in these years sets limits to the possibility of Petrarch's having attended his classes. Born in Bologna of a family apparently from Padua, del Virgilio had taught grammar in Bologna for some years before the fall of 1320, when Petrarch arrived there.[22] That the Commune of Bologna hired del Virgilio to teach poetry in 1321 seems to have been an innovation born of necessity.[23] The commune approved the money, a supplement to his ordinary income from student fees, on November 21, 1321, explicitly in order to retain at least one professor of grammar in the city after most had left with their students the previous April in protest.[24] The professors were presumably among those who initially went to Imola and then to other centers of learning such as Siena, Padua, and Florence. For Petrarch, his brother, and their tutor, the exodus provided an opportunity to travel through parts of northern and central Italy and to spend the summer of 1322 in Avignon.

---

during his time at Montpellier his dedication to ancient literature was dominant. Surprising his son on a visit to his room in the university town, the father supposedly burned all of Petrarch's literary codices except two, a manuscript of Virgil and Cicero's *De inventione* (ibid., 2:1047).

[22] *La corrispondenza poetica di Dante e Giovanni del Virgilio e l'ecloga di Giovanni al Mussato*, ed. G. Albini: rev. ed. Giovanni B. Pighi (Bologna, 1965), 19, for his Paduan origin. The provision of February 27, 1325, reimbursing him for unpaid salary for the school year 1323, refers in passing to his having taught many years: "et pluribus annis docuerit Bononie sciencias et libros predictos" (Lidonnici, "La corrispondenza," 240). Paul O. Kristeller, "Un'*Ars dictaminis* di Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 4 (1961): 181–83, provides the basic biography of Giovanni. His earliest dated poetic work was written in 1315 (ibid., 182).

[23] The appointment of November 21, 1321, is published by Albini, *La corrispondenza poetica*, 17, n. 6. The text reads: "Cum expediat consilio et populo Bon(onie) pro oservatione [conservatione?] Studii et ipsius augumentatione probos habere lectores et doctores in utraque scientia et facultate, et in civitate Bon(onie) presentialiter non sint alliqui doctores Versifficaturam poesim et magnos auctores videlicet Virgilium stacium lucchanum et Ovidium maiorem excepto mag[ist]ro Ioh(ann)e q(uon)d(am) mag(ist)ri Antoni qui dicitur de Vergillio qui, nisi sibi de publico provideatur, dicte lecture vocare [vacare] non potest, et instanter suplicatum sit per magistros repetitores et scholares Bononie commorantes d(omin)o capitaneo antianis et consulibus populi bononensis cogatur et compellatur ad poesim verxificaturam et dictos auctores legendos. Quid igitur placet consilio populi et masse populi providere ordinare et firmare quod dictus magister Ioh(ann)es teneatur et debeat quolibet anno legere et docere versificaturam et poesim arbitrio audientium et quibuslibet duobus annis dictos quatuor auctores pro libito auditorum scilicet quolibet anno duos ad voluntatem audientium."

[24] F. Filippini, "L'esodo degli studenti da Bologna nel 1321 e il *Polifemo* dantesco," *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna* 6 (1921): 141, discusses the public emolument.

Giovanni himself may have been on the verge of joining the dissident masters and students in November. On the appeal of "masters, assistants, and students staying in Bologna," he was "to be coerced and compelled" to teach versification and Virgil, Statius, Lucan, and Ovid for the next two years, two authors per year, in exchange for forty Bolognese lire per year. In addition, he was to interpret annually two other authors, to be determined by the students.

The two-year contract was not renewed; indeed, the commune proved incapable of paying Giovanni even for the second year he taught. Del Virgilio may have tried to live from student fees for the next school year, 1323–24, but in late 1324 he appears at Cesena, where he probably was hired to teach grammar by the local tyrant, Rainaldo dei Cinci.[25] Apparently cheated of his stipend in Cesena as well, he was saved from penury in the late winter of 1325 by Bologna's tardy payment of his stipend from 1323.[26] He may have returned to Bologna for the beginning of the school term in October 1325, and he was certainly in the city on March 18, 1326, when he acted as party to a notarial contract.[27]

Returning to Bologna for the beginning of the school year in October 1322, Petrarch would have been able to take advantage of Giovanni's teaching in 1322–23, and possibly in 1323–24 and 1325–26, at least until his own departure for Avignon in April of 1326. Deeply affected by the Paduan humanists both in his own poetry and in his approach to ancient texts, Giovanni could have provided the young Petrarch with invaluable experience in reading ancient literature. Giovanni's emphasis on the relationship between an author's biography and his writings could have contributed as well to

[25] Because of his inability to collect damages from an enemy who had assaulted and wounded him in April 1323, del Virgilio seems to have left Bologna late in the year and taken up residence in Cesena (Kristeller, "Un *ars dictaminis*," 183). The commune of Bologna had tried to assess damages against the assailant, but he had become a cleric. Giovanni's appeal to the papacy against his enemy also had proven fruitless. The failure does not seem a sufficient motive by itself, however, for his departure from Bologna.

[26] Lidonnici, "La corrispondenza," 234 and 236. The official documents for the payments are found in ibid., 240–42.

[27] Kristeller, "Un *Ars dictaminis*," 183, n. 4, cites Ghirardacci, who affirms that Giovanni taught in Bologna in 1325. The passage is found in Cherubino Ghirardacci, *Historia di vari successi d'Italia e particolarmente della città di Bologna*, 2 vols. (Bologna, 1669), 2:59.

Petrarch's humanizing of the great ancient writers.[28] No solid evidence exists, however, to support such a direct influence.

In any case, the enthusiasm with which Petrarch undertook the tremendous tasks of editing Virgil and Livy between 1325 and 1329 suggests the impetus that his experience in Bologna had given to his scholarly interests. Surely the inspiration for the cooperative venture of compiling the *Ambrosian Virgil* in 1325 during Petrarch's visit home came not from the father, who had neglected literary studies for twenty years, but from the son. Furthermore, within three years of his return to Avignon on his father's death in 1326, Petrarch completed the enormous task of producing an edition of decades I, III, and IV of Livy. From that point on, Petrarch himself became a source of humanistic inspiration for his contemporaries.[29]

2

Whereas earlier humanists implicitly rejected the didactic use of antiquity in the form of *florilegia*, collections of precepts, and *artes poetrie* in favor of direct contact with the original text, Petrarch did so explicitly. Carved from the living tissue of an author's work, a precept or aphorism became an inert specimen incapable of evoking a response in a reader or listener unaware of the original context whence it came. To Petrarch's mind, the moral failure of his age stemmed largely from the fact that those claiming to be teachers, schoolmasters, and preachers depended on this kind of material to inspire virtuous conduct.[30] Even less effective as spurs to ethical reform were

[28] Giovanni del Virgilio's contributions to humanism are summarized with ample bibliography in Gian Carlo Alessio, "I trattati grammaticali," 159–63. On Paduan influence, see especially Giuseppe Velli, "Sul linguaggio letterario di Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 24 (1981): 155–58.

[29] Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio*, 1.1:57–122, describes the adventure in detail. For reasons of space and competence, in the account of Petrarch's career that follows I will deal only peripherally with his enormous contribution to the revival and editing of ancient manuscripts. Sabbadini's pioneering *Scoperte* summarizes well the results of scholarly research on the subject down to World War I. The enormous advances made in the field since Giuseppe Billanovich's *Petrarca letterato: Lo scrittoio del Petrarca* (Rome, 1947; rpt. 1995) are recorded in dozens of articles and their bibliographies in *IMU*, which began publication in 1958.

[30] On this point, Riccardo Fubini's "Intendimenti umanistici e riferimenti patristici dal Petrarca al Valla: Alcune note sulla saggistica morale nell'umanesimo,"

the sort of abstract treatises on morality characteristic of Scholasticism. Only intensive study of the great works of Latin antiquity, which imparted moral lessons with an almost irresistible eloquence, could bring about moral reform.

Perhaps Petrarch's greatest contributions to humanism was his clear formulation of its ethical commitment. A reformer, he aimed at grafting Italian humanism into the European rhetorical tradition going back through Cicero to Isocrates, a tradition that linked eloquence to moral philosophy. Already, decades earlier, Brunetto Latini had insisted on the importance of the relationship between eloquence and virtue – even if he had viewed eloquence as primarily connected with oratory – but he had seen no need for eloquence to be Latin. For Petrarch, by contrast, the vernaculars could never serve as vehicles for truly elegant speech. A moral philosopher devoted to the reform both of himself and of his audience, Petrarch honed his language and his character through the study of the great writings of the ancient Romans. He hoped that by imitating their Latin speech he in turn might guide his readers to virtue.

A major burden of the opening letter of Petrarch's *Rerum familiarium* was to demonstrate the interrelationship between his style and his inner life. The chronological series of letters, he wrote, revealed to his shame the moral degeneration that he had experienced over the years. The letters of his youth had been written in "strong and sober" language, indicating "a truly strong mind," while with time his style had become "weaker and more humble and seemed to lack strength of character." Affirming, though, that the very despair he felt had made him stronger, he promised his correspondent: "You will see my actions daily become more fearless and my words more bold."[31]

Perhaps nowhere in his writings did Petrarch express the connection between personal style and actions more eloquently than in a letter addressed to Thomas of Messina, purportedly written in the

in his *Umanesimo e secolarizzazione da Petrarca a Valla* (Rome, 1990), 146–61, is essential. Fubini writes of Petrrach: "egli libera massime ed esempi dalla rigidezza e convenzionalità che avevano assunto nella tradizione e nella dottrina" (159).

[31] *Rerum fam.* I.1, in *Familiari*, 1:13 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:13 (English). John M. Najemy, *Between Friends: Discourses of Power and Desire in the Machiavelli–Vettori Letters of 1513–1515* (Princeton, 1993), 26–30, carefully analyzes the artful construction of this letter. He points out the extent to which Petrarch simultaneously denies and confirms the "literary" character of his familiar letters (30).

1330s but likely written after 1345 to fill a chronological gap in his early correspondence:

> The care of the mind calls for a philosopher, while the proper use of language requires an orator. We must neglect neither one if, as they say, we are to return to the earth and be led about by the mouths of men.[32]

We must strive to reform our lives while at the same time reforming our speech because

> Our speech is not a small indicator of our mind, nor is our mind a small controller of our speech. Each depends upon the other but while one remains in one's breast, the other emerges into the open. The one ornaments it as it is about to emerge and shapes it as it wants to; the other announces how it is as it emerges into the open.[33]

So intimately interrelated are moral disposition and outward speech that "speech is without dignity unless the mind possesses its own majesty."[34] Petrarch continued:

---

[32] *Rerum fam.* I.9, in *Familiari* 1:45 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:47 (English). On the problems of organizing Petrarch's correspondence chronologically, see *Familiari* 1:xxv–xxxi. In Latin, the opening passage reads: "Animi cura philosophum querit, eruditio lingue oratoris est propria; neutra nobis negligenda, si nos, ut aiunt, humo tollere et per ora virum volitare propositum est." The phrase "humo tollere et per ora virum volitare" is a reworking of Virgil, *Georg.* III, 8–9: "Temptanda via est, qua me quoque possim/ tollere humo victorque virorum volitare per ora." Most of my references to classical literature in this letter are taken from Ugo Dotti, *Le Familiari: Introduzione, Traduzione e Note* (Rome, 1991), 114–15.

[33] *Rerum fam.* I.9, in *Familiari* 1:45 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:47 (English). The Latin reads: "Nec enim parvus aut index animi sermo est aut sermonis moderator est animus. Alter pendet ex altero; ceterum ille latet in pectore, hic exit in publicum; ille comit egressurum et qualem esse vult fingit, hic egrediens qualis ille sit nuntiat." Petrarch's "Nec parvus aut index animi sermo est" is surely influenced by Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, *Epist.* 114, par. 3: "Non potest alius esse ingenio, alius animo color." His extended contrast between *ille* and *hic* mirrors Seneca: "Si ille sanus est, si compositus, gravis, temperans, ingenium quoque siccum ac sobrium est: illo vitiato hoc quoque adflatur." Petrarch, however, repeats the contrast between the two pronouns three times more: "illius paretur arbitrio, huius testimonio creditur; utrique igitur consulendum est, ut et ille in hunc sobrie severus, et hic in illum veraciter norit esse magnificus ...." Also compare the opening lines of Petrarch's letter: "Animi cura philosophum querit, eruditio lingue oratoris est propria (45)" with Seneca's in *Epist.* 115, par. 2: "Oratio cultus animi est."

[34] A few lines below, Petrarch continued (*Rerum fam.* I.9): "Quanquam ubi animo consultum fuerit, neglectus esse sermo non possit, sicut, ex diverso, adesse sermoni dignitas non potest, nisi animo sua maiestas affuerit." The Senecan subtext reads: "Ideo ille [animus] curetur; ab illo sensus, ab illo verba exeunt, ab illo nobis est habitus, vultus, incessus. Illo sano ac valente oratio quoque robusta, fortis, virilis est; si ille procubuit, et cetera ruinam sequuntur" (*Ad Lucil.* 114, par. 23). The *repetitio* here may have reinforced Petrarch's extended use of *ille* and *hic*.

> What good will it do if you immerse yourself wholly in the Ciceronian springs and know well the writings either of the Greeks or of the Romans? You will indeed be able to speak ornately, charmingly, sweetly, and sublimely; you certainly will not be able to speak seriously, austerely, judiciously, and, most importantly, uniformly.[35]

In short, one's moral life and one's words must not contradict one another.

While agreeing with a fictive interlocutor on the value of living models of virtuous behavior for moral reform, Petrarch insisted:

> How many men we know in our own age who, unaffected by the examples of those speaking, were suddenly awakened, as if aroused, from a very evil life to a very seemly one only by the voices of others![36]

Consequently, to think that "everything advantageous to men" has already been written over the centuries by authors of "godlike talents" is to misunderstand the need for incessant effort on behalf of the cause of virtue. In this eloquent passage, Petrarch emphasized the central role of eloquence for moral reform and the scholar's duty to use his knowledge and talents on behalf of his fellow men. At the same time, he presented the study of eloquence as satisfying the scholar's own spiritual needs.

> Let thousands of years flow by, and let centuries follow upon centuries, virtue will never be sufficiently praised, and never will teachings for the greater love of God and the hatred of sin suffice; never will the road to the investigation of new ideas be blocked to keen minds. Let us therefore be of good heart; we do not labor in vain, nor will they who will be born after many ages and before the end of an aging world. What is rather to be feared is that men may cease to exist before our pursuit of humanistic studies breaks through to the intimate mysteries of truth. Finally, if no sense of charity toward our fellow men drove us, I would still consider the study of eloquence of the greatest aid to ourselves rather than something to be held in the lowest esteem.[37]

---

[35] The passage in Latin reads: "Quid enim attinet quod ciceronianis te fontibus prorsus immerseris, quod nulla te neque Grecorum neque nostrorum scripta pretereant? ornate quidem, lepide, dulciter, altisone loqui poteris; graviter, severe sapienterque et, quod super omnia est, uniformiter, certe non poteris." The subtext here is again Seneca, *Ad Lucil.* 114.3: "Si ille sanus est, si compositus, gravis, temperans, ingenium quoque siccum ac sobrium est."

[36] *Rerum fam.* I.9, in *Familiari* 1:46 (Latin). I prefer my own translation here. The Latin reads: "Quam multos, quibus nichil omnino loquentium exempla contulerant, etate nostra velut experrectos agnovimus et a sceleratissime vite cursu ad summam repente modestiam alienis tantum vocibus fuisse conversos!"

[37] *Rerum Fam.* I.9, in *Familiari* 1:47 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters.* 1:49 (translation modified slightly here). The Latin reads: "Sed hic rursus occurres: 'Quid enim est

Petrarch's long and intimate contact with the writings of Cicero helps to explain this passionate affirmation of the value of eloquence, but while he never defined the link between eloquence and the trivium, in contrast with Cicero and Latini he did not appear to envisage eloquence as a monopoly of the rhetorician.[38] He assumed that the moral force of eloquence belonged not only to prose but also to poetry, traditionally the domain of the grammarian with his knowledge of mythology and allegory.[39] Eloquence also depended on establishing good texts and their correct interpretation and those, at least in ancient times, were the tasks of the grammarian. Like Lovato and Mussato, Petrarch's humanism is more that of a grammarian than that of a rhetorician.

---

opus amplius elaborare, si omnia que ad utilitates hominum spectant, iam ante mille annos tam multis voluminibus stilo prorsus mirabili et divinis ingeniis scripta manent?' Pone, queso, hanc solicitudinem; nunquam te res ista trahat ad inertiam; hunc enim metum et quidam ex veteribus nobis abstulerunt et ego post me venturis aufero. Decem adhuc redeant annorum milia, secula seculis aggregentur: nunquam satis laudabitur virtus; nunquam ad amorem Dei, ad odium voluptatum precepta sufficient; nunquam acutis ingeniis iter obstruetur ad novarum rerum indaginem. Bono igitur animo simus: non laboramus in irritum, non frustra laborabunt qui post multas etates sub finem mundi senescentis orientur. Potius illud metuendum est, ne prius homines esse desinant, quam ad intimum veritatis archanum humanorum studiorum cura perruperit. Postremo, si ceterorum hominum caritas nulla nos cogeret, optimum tamen et nobis ipsis fructuosissimum arbirarer eloquentie studium non in ultimis habere." The Senecan subtext reads: "Multum adhuc restat operis multumque restabit, nec ulli nato post mille saecula praecludetur occasio aliquid adhuc adiciendi" (*Ad Lucil.* 64.7)

[38] For the Ciceronian link between eloquence and moral philosophy, see Etienne Gilson, "Beredsamkeit und Weisheit bei Cicero," in *Das Neue Cicerobild*, ed. K. Büchner (Darmstadt, 1971), 191–92 and 201–02, with references. The connection reflects Cicero's general conception of eloquence as equivalent to rhetoric. For an excellent discussion of that relationship, see Jerrold Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism: The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom (Petrarch to Valla)* (Princeton, 1968), 3–30. The forceful statement of the moral goal of rhetoric is found in the opening chapters of *De inventione*, I.1–3. The *De inventione* was the most important manual of rhetoric in the Middle Ages. Almost unknown until the fourteenth century were relevant passages from *De oratore*: I.48; and III.55–56 and 145.

[39] Isidore includes history under grammar because "Haec disciplina ad grammaticam pertinet, quia quidquid dignum memoria est litteris mandatur" (*Etymol.*, I.41). For Alcuin, grammar was the queen of the trivium: "Grammatica est litteralis scientia, et est custodes recte loquendi et scribendi." It is divided "in vocem, in litteras, in syllabas, partes, dictiones, orationes, definitiones, pedes, accentus ... tropos, prosam, metra, fabulas, historias." *PL* 101, cols. 857d–58a. Rabanus Maurus, some decades later, defined grammar as "scientia interpretandi poetas atque historicos et recta scribendi loquendique ratio:" (*De institutione clericorum*, 18: *PL* 107, col. 395).

In contrast to Cicero and Latini, who revived Cicero's conception of the intimate relationship between the orator and the virtuous life, Petrarch did not envisage eloquence as uniquely or even primarily wedded to public life, where speech was corrupted by the need to satisfy the demands of the mob. For Petrarch, rather, eloquence was more likely to be achieved in the scholar's study, the result of a lifelong commitment to grammatical as well as rhetorical studies. Correspondingly, Petrarch envisaged the relationship between speaker (or writer) and audience as an individual and personal one. Cicero's ethical–political thought would only assume its full importance for humanists working within a republican political milieu after 1400.

Accentuating the vital importance of grammar and rhetoric for human conduct, Petrarch at the same time rejected dialectic, the third member of the *trivium*, as a rival of the other two. While it sharpened young minds, he felt that dialectic should be left behind once it had served its purpose. Whereas logical arguments, the product of dialectical analysis, spoke only to reason, he maintained, eloquence had the capacity to move the will, the affective, active part of the soul. He stressed the importance of the will over the intellect as well as the superiority of eloquence to scholastic approaches to morality.

> It is better to will the good than to know the truth. The first is never without merit; the latter can often be polluted with crime and then admits no excuse.[40]

Made late in life (1367), this statement of the relationship between will and intellect was Petrarch's first explicit affirmation of the will's superiority. Nevertheless, the statement reflected a consistent emphasis in his prior work on the reforming virtue of eloquence and on the will as the site of his own spiritual malaise. Doubtless the Augustine of the *Confessions* had helped him identify the source of good and evil in human activity.

Although one may be tempted to associate Petrarch's conclusion with contemporary theological and philosophical debates that he probably attended as a young intellectual in Avignon in the late

[40] *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*, ed. P.G. Ricci, in Petrarch, *Prose*, 748. The English translation is taken from "On His Own Ignorance and that of Many Others," translated by Charles Trinkaus, in *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, ed. Ernst E. Cassirer et al. (Chicago, 1950), 107.

1320s and the 1330s, it is unlikely that the young Petrarch, any more than the old, would have had much patience with the sophisticated intricacies of nominalist–realist controversies. Even if current scholastic debates had become part of his intellectual awareness, therefore, his declaration of the will's superiority in 1367 should not be taken as an affirmation of his allegiance to a scholastic sect, but rather as an articulation of an assumption underlying his commitment to rhetoric.

For centuries, Italian *dictatores* had assumed that the art of persuasion had had more to do with motivating the will than the intellect, that the personality of a particular audience should condition both the form and content of a communication. While Petrarch's voluntarism might have philosophical and theological implications, his own concerns were rhetorical and psychological. Thirty years later, Salutati, influenced by Scotus, would develop the theological implication of Petrarch's psychological voluntarism by declaring the will to be the preeminent faculty in the Divine nature and the sensorium of transcendence in the human one. Petrarch, however, was content with having justified the link between eloquence and virtue by grounding it in the way human beings were constituted.

Rather than seek nominalistic inspiration for Petrarch, it is more productive to ask why two voluntaristic movements enjoyed increasing success in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. By 1400, in transalpine Europe, voluntarism also showed its broad appeal in the form of a new pietism embodied in the *Devotio moderna.* Each of these three movements contributed in its own way to the swelling interest of late-medieval Europeans in the volitional powers of human beings, an interest which, by the early sixteenth century, generated the major theological issue of the Protestant and Catholic Reformations. Although the purpose of this book is to explain the reasons for the origins and development of humanism in Italy, the fact that the voluntarist impulse at the core of humanism was common to new theological, philosophical, and pietistic movements in northern Europe as well suggests the ultimate inadequacy of any localized explanation of the phenomenon. Petrarch's formulation of the link between the study of ancient literature and history on the one hand and the moral goal of humanism on the other had another original dimension. Earlier humanists manifested three different attitudes concerning the value of the pagan authors for modern-day Christians. First, they tended to ignore the religious gulf between paganism and Christianity, thereby rendering ancient thought and heroes

unthreatening and accessible to Christians eager to borrow and imitate. Lovato and most members of the first and second generations, including Mussato until late middle age, wrote as if there existed a seamless continuity between pagan and Christian culture. Second, when the assumption subsequently came under attack by conservative Christians, Mussato attempted to satisfy both his critics and his own conscience by assuming an apologetic stance that explained away any sharp contrast between pagan and Christian letters through allegorical interpretations of otherwise offensive pagan material. The third posture, again represented by Mussato, but now in his old age, embraced the position of the accusers of classicism and denounced pagan writings as dangerous to the faith and to be either avoided entirely or used only with great caution. A fourth approach, consciously opting to rely on pagan guidance only in matters of secular concern, lay in the future.

Sensing a need to pass beyond his immediate predecessors' positions, those of blithely ignoring the pagan character of ancient literature and history, of distorting it through allegory, or of damning the ancients out of hand, Petrarch faced up to the task of defining the relationship between pagan authors and Christianity so as to legitimize as far as possible the use of pagan sources for Christian purposes. He really had little choice personally. In Petrarch a deep religious faith encountered a passion for pagan culture, producing a conflict of religious and secular values that demanded resolution.[41]

Scholars have long recognized the Christian stamp of Petrarch's humanism, but they have not emphasized that his position represented a reorientation of an essentially secular movement already underway. In Petrarch's hands, the narrow, civic focus of earlier humanism became transformed into one more broadly relevant for western Europeans generally. If humanism was to become a significant force in European culture, it had eventually to engage in discourse with Christianity and justify its existence in Christian terms.

Up to this point in the analysis, the appeal of humanism has been interpreted as arising out of tension between the evolving character of Italian society and the ideals of medieval culture, but to explain the international appeal of Petrarch's writing I must say something

[41] Of the large bibliography on this topic, perhaps the finest analysis is written by Charles Trinkaus, *"In Our Image and Likeness": Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*, 2 vols. (London, 1970; rpt. Notre Dame, Ind., 1995), 1:3–50.

about another set of contrasts which, although boldly formulated in Italy, was first articulated in France. Just as ancient Rome gradually came to serve humanists as a model of a secular society against which the character of their own society assumed greater definition, so contemporary Scholastics considered Aristotle's political and ethical writings as a theoretical model for understanding theirs. Although unconcerned with establishing the historical context for the ideas in Aristotle's works, Scholastics used his concept of the completely secular society, which he considered to be natural, as a basis for analyzing spiritual–temporal relationships in their own day.

In its theoretical effort to justify princely claims of independence from spiritual supervision, at least one group of Scholastics expressly intended to put the Aristotelian model at the service of secular power. Not surprisingly, the first use of the model for this purpose occurred in late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century France, whose monarch, Philip IV, was locked in combat with Boniface VIII over the extent to which the secular sword could act independently of papal oversight. In 1301, John of Paris, or John Quidort, in his *De potestate papali et regali*, made a frontal assault on the traditional Augustinian–Gregorian assessment of temporal power as essentially negative, charged with the task of restraining sinners from evil so that the Church could accomplish its spiritual mission of saving their souls. John's approach was to deny the validity of conceiving of spiritual versus temporal as positive versus negative, claiming that the secular power also had a spiritual mission in helping its subjects to lead moral lives.[42] Aristotle's *Politics* was taken to imply that in post-

[42] A key passage of John's work makes the distinction between the natural world, ruled by the king, and the supranatural world, governed by the Church: "Ceterum est considerandum quod homo non solum ordinatur ad bonum tale quod per naturam acquiri potest, quod est vivere secundum virtutem, sed ulterius ordinatur ad finem supernaturalem, qui est vita aeterna, ad quam tota hominum multitudo viventium secundum virtutem ordinata est. Ideo oportet aliquem unum esse qui multitudinem ad hunc finem dirigat. Et si quidem ad hunc finem posset perveniri virtute humanae naturae, necesse esset ad officium regis humani pertineret dirigere homines in hunc finem, quia hunc regem humanum dicimus cui commissa est cura summa regiminis in rebus humanis. Sed quia viam aeternam non consequitur homo per virtutem humanam sed divinam ... ideo perducere ad illum finem non est humani regiminis sed divini": *Johannes Quidort von Paris: Über königliche und päpstliche Gewalt (De regia potestate et papali)*, ed. and trans. Fritz Bleienstein (Stuttgart, 1969), 78. On the significance of John's distinction between natural and supranatural for his limitation of papal power, see Walter Ullman, *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1961), 263–65. Cf. R.W. Carstens, *The Medieval Antecedents of Constitutionalism* (New York and San Francisco, 1992), 49–58.

lapsarian ancient society, secular power had had sole responsibility for public and personal morality. Christianity had revealed a new spiritual dimension of human existence over which the Church had specific control, but that did not necessarily entail completely discrediting the role of secular power in the ethical sphere. Rather, the new situation called for cooperation between the two governments in guiding Christians through the world toward their heavenly destination.

Less than a decade later, in Italy, Dante reflected a similarly positive conception of temporal power when in his *De monarchia* he contrasted the emperor's responsibility for seeing to the "terrestrial beatitude" of his subjects with the Church's responsibility for seeing to their "celestial beatitude." Whereas the emperor should recognize the greater dignity of the pope because of the pope's higher mission, the emperor was supreme in the terrestrial sphere.

We have seen enough of the intellectual milieu of Padua in the early fourteenth century to realize that the secularism of Marsilio of Padua, so pervasive in his *Defensor pacis*, was not exceptional. What distinguished Marsilio was his re-creation of the model of an ancient totalitarian secular state that monopolized coercion, a state in which the demands of religion remained no more than recommendations by religious specialists until officially subsumed by the legal system of secular government.

Marsilio went too far for most of his countrymen, but the diffusion of Aristotle's ethical thought throughout western Europe from the late thirteenth century onward testifies to a growing awareness that a whole realm of ethical life, if not wholly independent of soteriological concerns, nonetheless enjoyed some degree of autonomy. To this was added the conviction that even if not a Christian, Aristotle was the master guide to the sphere of secular experience. Against that background, Petrarch's grievance with Aristotle can be interpreted as an expression of his eagerness to compete with the Scholastics for control over newly reclaimed land. Because of their insularity, Petrarch's Italian predecessors had been unaware of a potential rivalry between their Latin authors and Aristotle, but from the vantage point of Avignon, the competitive nature of the claims was evident.

By setting the study and imitation of ancient letters within a Christian framework, Petrarch eventually transformed a specifically Italian phenomenon into a movement of international proportions with adherents scattered throughout continental Europe, spreading outward

from the papal, French, and imperial courts. He successfully convinced his readers that reading pagan literature was not only pleasurable but morally useful, and that consequently it was not only compatible with but even helpful for the pursuit of salvation.[43]

Petrarch himself only arrived at that conclusion after deep inner struggle. In a long passage in the *De otio* (1346), largely ignored by students of Petrarch's intellectual biography, he described the failure of his early teachers, among them surely Convenevole, to instill in him a love of Christianity. Rather, they had treated Christian literature with disdain and

> ridiculed the Psalms of David (compared to which no writing is more meaningful), and the whole text of the sacred page, as not being other than tales of old women.[44]

On his own, aided by God's grace, however, "late, nay very late" (the words are Augustine's), Petrarch's life was changed by reading the *Confessions* – changed in a way similar to that in which Augustine's own life had been by reading Cicero's *Hortensius*. Thus, Petrarch wrote of Augustine:

> He first aroused in me the love of the true; he first taught me, who for so long before had breathed pestilential air, to breath salubriously.[45]

---

[43] Franco Simone, *Il Rinascimento francese: Studi e ricerche* (Turin, 1961), 54–63, discusses the connections between Petrarch and contemporary French scholars. The nature of his reputation in France is made clear by Jean de Montreuil (d. 1419), who refers to him as "devotissimus catholicus et celeberrimus philosophus moralis": Jean de Montreuil, *Epistolario*, ed. E. Ornato, in *Opera*, 1.1 (Turin, 1963), 315, n. 208, cited by Nicholas Mann, "The Manuscripts of Petrarch's *De remediis*: A Checklist," *IMU* 14 (1971): 57. See also E. Ornato, *Jean Muret et ses amis: Nicolas de Clamanges et Jean de Montreuil* (Geneva, 1969) and *Préludes à la Renaissance: Aspects de la vie intellectuelle en France au XVe siècle* ed. Carla Bozzolo and Ezio Ornato (Paris, 1992).

For Petrarch's contact with Germans, see Konrad Burdach with R. Kienast, *Aus Petrarcas ältestem deutschen Schülerkreise: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1929), and *Petrarcas Briefwechsel mit deutschen Zeitgenossen*, ed. Paul Piur (Berlin, 1933), nos. 4 and 7, respectively, of Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation: Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung. See also Frank L. Borchardt, "Petrarch: The German Connection," in *Francis Petrarch: Six Centuries Later: A Symposium*, ed. A. Scaglione (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1975), 418–31; by the same author, "First Contacts with Italy: German Chancellery Humanism in Prague," in *The Renaissance and Reformation in Germany: An Introduction*, ed. G. Hoffmeister (New York, 1977), 1–16; and Heinz Otto Burger, *Renaissance, Humanismus, Reformation: Deutsche Literatur im europäischen Kontext* (Bad Homburg and Berlin, 1969), 119. Burger begins his study of early German humanism with 1450.

[44] *De otio*, 103: "... sed eos qui psalterium daviticum, qua ulla pregnantior scriptura est, et omnem divine textum pagine non aliter quam aniles fabulas irriderent."

[45] Ibid., 104: "Cur enim de illo non fateor, quod ille de M. Tullio fatetur? Ille me primum ad amorem veri erexit, ille me primum docuit suspirare salubriter, qui tam

What had first been a pastime gradually became an occupation:

> I undertook sacred Ambrose, who is to be named reverently; then Jeremiah and Gregory, and finally Giovanni of the Golden Tongue and Lactantius flowing like a stream of milk; so that with this illustrious entourage I reverently approached the territory of sacred scripture, which before I had despised, and found that everything was different from what I had believed.[46]

Petrarch's purchase of St. Paul's letters and Augustine's *City of God* in 1325 may have already indicated an altered attitude toward Christian literature: his possession of at least four works of Augustine's by 1333 almost certainly did.[47] One of these, listed as *Confessiones*, may have been the copy of the work given him in 1333 by Dionigi da Borgo San Sepulcro. The gift of the work in that year would help to explain why later he looked back to 1333 as a watershed in his relationship to Christian literature.[48]

The contradictory pagan voices that the young Petrarch heard while reading ancient literature might already have occasioned doubts about the goals he was pursuing. His love for Laura and for fame, nourished by his study of pagan poetry and history, ran counter to the moral lessons of pagan philosophers like Seneca, which brought into question the value of any external objective. The classi-

---

diu ante letaliter suspirassem." As for the chronology of the change, Petrarch remarks (ibid.): "Sero, iam senior, nullo duce, primo quidem hestitare, deinde vero pedetentim retrocedere ceperam, ac disponente Illo, qui malis nostris ad gloriam suam semper, sepe etiam ad salutem nostram uti novit ...."

[46] Ibid., 104: "Accessit sacer et submissa fronte nominandus Ambrosius, accessere Ieronimus Gregoriusque, novissimus oris aurei Iohannes et exundans lacteo torrente Lactantius: ita hoc pulcerrimo comitatus Scripturarum sacrarum fines quos ante despexeram venerabundus ingredior et invenio cuncta se aliter habere quam credideram."

[47] For the dates, see Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dalle prime alle ultime letture del Petrarca," in *Il Petrarca ad Arqua: Atti del convegno di studi nel VII centenario (1370–1374)* (Padua, 1975), 13–47; and by the same author, *La tradizione del testo*, 1.1:58–64.

[48] See *Rerum fam.* IV.1, in *Familiari* 1:158, ascribed to 1336, where Petrarch dates his efforts to reform his life from 1333: "Nondum michi tertius annus effluxit, ex quo voluntas illa perversa et nequam, que me totum habebat et in aula cordis mei sola sine contradictione regnabat, cepit aliam habere rebellem et reluctantem sibi, inter quas iandudum in campis cogitationum mearum de utriusque hominis imperio laborissima et anceps etiam nunc pugna conseritur." Although the letter in its present form was almost surely written after 1345, I believe that Petrarch probably preserved the genuine chronological relationships among the events represented in the text. Umberto Bosco's well-known description of Petrarch as "senza storia" (without a history) is an exaggeration.

cal world offered its own powerful critique of the generally accepted secular values of classical society.[49] It was Petrarch's contact with the *Confessions*, however, that compelled him to scrutinize and re-evaluate the character of his life, by setting the conflict between secular and spiritual values within a Christian context, where his own eternal salvation was at stake. The entrance of his beloved brother, Gherardo, into the Cistercian monastery at Montrieux in 1343 heightened Petrarch's internal tensions and initiated a decade of serious inner debate about his own vocation.[50]

At its most intense, the moral crisis led Petrarch to raise the possibility that he should abandon his literary studies and writing projects altogether to devote himself to sacred reading and contemplation.[51] His ambivalence is apparent in the *Secretum*, written in 1347 in the form of a dialogue between "Franciscus" and "Augustinus" and revised significantly in 1349 and 1353. As in his life so too in this work, the issue was left unresolved. At bottom, the problem for Petrarch appeared to be not so much his love of ancient pagan authors in itself as his use of them to attain worldly fame.

His move from Provence to Italy in the summer of 1353 and then his stable residence at Milan brought with them a decided and per-

---

[49] As Hans Baron notes, however, Petrarch was able to interpret Cicero's appeal in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* to suppress all *affectus* and passions in the name of reason (IV.19) as motivated by the search for glory: *Petrarch's Secretum: Its Making and Its Meaning* (Cambridge, 1985), 134.

[50] Giles Constable, "Petrarch and Monasticism," in *Francesco Petrarca: Citizen of the World: Proceedings of the World Petrarch Congress, Washington, D.C., April 6–13 1974*, ed. Aldo S. Bernardo (Padua and Albany, N.Y., 1980), 59–86, documents Petrarch's attitude toward monasticism and particularly the effect on him of Gherardo's becoming a monk (76–77).

[51] For important examples of his meditations on his sinfulness during the Black Death, see *Epist. metr.* I.1, in *Opera*, 1330–32; and edition with Italian trans. in *Opere*, ed. Giovanni Ponte (Milan 1968), 332–36; as well as *Querolus*, in *Petrarch's Bucolicum carmen*, ed. and trans. Thomas Bergin (New Haven and London, 1974), 128–38. The stages involved in producing the *Secretum* are discussed at length by Francisco Rico, in his *Lectura del Secretum*, vol. 1 of his *Vida u obra de Petrarca*, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 4 (Padua, 1974). See the important contribution of Hans Baron, *Petrarch's Secretum*, already mentioned. See also Rico's comments on Baron, "'Ubi puer, ibi senex': Un libro de Hans Baron y el *Secretum* de 1353," in *Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell' umanesimo: Atti del convegno internazionale, Firenze, 19-22 maggio, 1981*, *Quaderni petrarcheschi* 9–10 (1992–93): 9:165–237. Petrarch's "I'vo pensando" (264), in whose opening lines he writes of the intensity of his weeping (lines 1–5), constitutes the poetic analogue of the *Secretum*. In both, the author's pursuit of love and glory are identified as the root causes of his unhappiness. For the date of the work as 1347–48, see Baron, *Petrarch's Secretum*, 47–57.

manent improvement in his mood, together with a diminution of his suspicion that scholarly preoccupations somehow contaminated his Christian devotion.[52] While it is always dangerous to chart a pattern of intellectual development in an author who incessantly revised and rearranged his earlier work, Petrarch's writings in the last twenty years of his life suggest that he ultimately found an accommodation between Christian and pagan letters that was acceptable to his conscience.

The basic elements of the accord can be found in fragmentary form throughout Petrarch's work. Unlike Mussato, Petrarch rejected the traditional apologetic position of defenders of poetry, who considered pagan poets in their most sublime expressions to be uttering Christian truths under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Although he insisted that the poetic art functioned "not without a certain internal and divinely infused power in the mind of the poet–seer," he took the message in each case to be the poet's own.[53] In his *De otio religioso*, for

[52] This paragraph is based on Baron, *Petrarch's Secretum*, 230–35.

[53] The phrase is taken from *Collatio laureationis*, 31: "in arte poeta secus est, in qua nil agitur sine interna quadam et divinitus in animum vatis infusa vi." Petrarch's remark is based on Cicero, *Pro Archia* VIII.18. Petrarch's position on the pursuit of ultimate truth by pagan thinkers is found in *Invective contra medicum: Testo latino e volgarizzamento di ser Domenico Silvestri*, ed. P.G. Ricci (Rome, 1950), 71–72. On Petrarch's attitude toward divine inspiration of the ancients, the theme of the *poeta theologus*, see my "Coluccio Salutati and the Conception of the *Poeta Theologus* in the Fourteenth Century," *Renaissance Quarterly* 30 (1977): 542–44. Cf. Giorgio Ronconi, *Le origini delle dispute umanistiche sulla poesia (Mussato e Petrarca)* (Rome, 1976), 109 and 116. On the question of the earlier humanists on this issue in general, see above, 157-58, n. 113. In contrast with the poets, ancient seers such as the Sibyls were considered by Petrarch to have been reliable witnesses to the divine plan for the redemption of the world: *Il De otio religioso di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. G. Rotondi (Vatican City, 1958), 27–29. See Charles Trinkaus, "Humanist Treatises on the Status of the Religious: Petrarch, Salutati, Valla," *Studies in the Renaissance* 11 (1964): 14. Trinkaus is the first scholar to appreciate the importance of the *De otio religioso* as a document of Petrarch's thinking. See his *In Our Image and Likeness*, 1:3–50.

Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle, *Petrarch's Genius: Pentimento and Prophecy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991), espouses the unusual thesis that Petrarch believed the ancient poets to have been divinely inspired with prophetic truth. This is the purpose of her criticism (153) of my article, "Salutati and the *Poeta Theologus*." She attributes to me an odd conception of theology (204, n. 6): "His [Witt's] notion of theology as expressing 'truths accessible to natural reason' (539) is contrary to Christian tradition; that is the function of philosophy, not theology." The phrase that Boyle cites in quotations is found in the following context (Witt, "Salutati and the *Poeta theologus*," 538–39): "... all three fourteenth-century writers eventually succeeded in defending the sacral character of ancient poetry, which in their own eyes gave it nobility, without having to resort to medieval arguments for a direct divine influence acting on the poet or for a secret tradition of divine truth initially derived from God's Revelation. Although

instance, Petrarch specifically interpreted the famous passage of Virgil's *Eclogues*, IV. 6–7,

> Once more the Virgin comes and Saturn's reign,
> Behold, a Heaven-born offspring earthward descends![54]

as predicting the advent not of Christ but rather of Augustus. The imminent coming of the Savior had been announced by various signs throughout the world in Virgil's day and doubtless the poet had heard of them, but "because he did not hope for so great an event, he referred them to the Roman Emperor, for he knew nothing greater than him." Virgil's description of the Underworld in the *Aeneid* had become a favorite with those interested in demonstrating the poet's prophetic powers. In Petrarch's case, however, when addressing Virgil personally in *Rerum fam.* XXIV.11, regarding what the ancient poet actually found in the Underworld after his death, the humanist asked: "How far from the truth were your dreams?"[55] Years later, in *Sen.* IV.5, in discussing the meaning of Virgil's underworld, Petrarch considered the poet to have written fictions disguising moral truths.[56] At the same time, Petrarch recognized that certain pagan poets had acquired by their own natural powers some notion of a first cause and of the One Substance of the divine being.[57]

As for the philosophers, in *Rerum fam.* II.9, an early letter, Petrarch highly praised Cicero, whose books "are the guides of the right way to it [the Christian faith]" and, on Augustine's authority, even higher praise to Plato, who "teaches and proclaims the true faith."[58] Years

---

the ancient poets frequently expressed theological truths, these were truths accessible to natural reason. Whereas the validity of this characterization of Petrarch and Boccaccio can easily be demonstrated by reference to their work, Salutati's thoughts on the subject are more difficult to define ...." It is difficult to see how my statement, describing the three humanists' belief that whatever valid theological conceptions the ancient poets did hold were the product of reason, can be taken as my general definition of theology.

But Prof. Boyle's mistaken criticism reveals her intention to limit theological ideas to those produced by divine inspiration. This view overlooks the conviction of most if not all Scholastics that ancient philosophers were able to establish a limited number of theological truths through the exercise of reason.

[54] *De otio*, 29.

[55] *Rerum Fam.* XXIV.11, in *Familiari* 4:252 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 3:340 (English).

[56] *Opera*, 2:868: *Letters of Old Age*, 1:139–151.

[57] *Invectiva*, III, in *Invettive*, 71–72.

[58] Again, this praise is directly related to the effect of the two thinkers on Augustine: *Rerum Fam.* II.9, in *Familiari* 1:92–93: " ... non solum familiariter illis uti non puduit [Augustinus], sed ingenue etiam fateri se in libris Platonicorum magnam fidei

later, in his *On His Own Ignorance and that of Many Others* (1367), Petrarch appeared to gloss the latter observation when he declared that among the philosophers Plato "came closer to the truth."[59] Or again, in stressing Plato's superior achievement over Aristotle's, he credited both with going as far in natural and human matters as one can advance with the aid of mortal genius and study, but in divine ones Plato and the Platonists rose higher, though none of them could reach the goal he aimed at.[60] Stripped of any sanctification that they might have had under the influence of divine inspiration, the ancient pagan thinkers and poets were for Petrarch fallible human beings whose works had to be assessed accordingly.

Throughout his mature life, the touchstone for Petrarch's belief that pagan literature was relevant to Christian faith was Augustine's avowal in the *Confessions* that his reading of Cicero's *Hortensius* had given him the initial impetus to reform his life.[61] That Petrarch saw himself relating to Augustine in much the same way as the latter related to Cicero encouraged Petrarch to see an intellectual filiation stretching back through time and across religious boundaries. The model of Augustine, who drew broadly on his education in pagan letters to further his ministry of the Divine Word, also provided general legitimacy for Petrarch's own use of pagan works in constructing his own version of Christian morality.[62]

Characteristically for Petrarch's approach to issues, no single writing of the last twenty years of his life treats his view of the connec-

---

nostre partem invenisse, et ex libro Ciceronis qui vocatur *Hortensius*, mutatione mirabili ab omni spe fallaci et ab inutilibus discordantium sectarum contentionibus aversum, ad solius veritatis studium fuisse conversum, et lectione libri illius inflammatum, ut mutatis affectibus et abiectis voluptatibus, volare altius inciperet ...." He concludes: "Nemo dux spernendus est qui viam salutis ostendit. Quid ergo studio veritatis obesse potest vel Plato vel Cicero, quorum alterius scola fidem veracem non modo non impugnat sed docet et predicat, alterius libri recti ad illam itineris duces sunt?" He bases his statements on *Conf.* VII.9.13 and III.4.7. At the same time, he notes that divine guidance is necessary in reading their works to avoid following aspects of their teaching that should be avoided.

Petrarch considered Plato closer to Christianity than Aristotle, but nowhere else does his praise of Plato go so far.

[59] *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*, 742.

[60] Ibid., 754.

[61] For numerous references to Cicero's salubrious effect on Augustine, see Dotti, *Vita di Petrarca*, 37.

[62] He felt the strongest parallels between his own life and that of Augustine: "Quotiens *Confessionum* tuarum libros lego, inter duos contrarios affectus, spem videlicet et metum, letis non sine lacrymis interdum legere me arbitror non alienam sed propriae mee peregrinationis historiam": (*Secretum*, in Petrarch, *Prose*, 42).

tions between pagan literature and his Christian mission exhaustively. Perhaps the most satisfying exposition, because it is largely free of the emotional contradictions that encumber more autobiographical discussions, occurs in a letter written in 1360 to Giovanni Boccaccio.[63] Boccaccio had been warned by a prophecy that he and Petrarch would both die within two years and that their continued literary labors posed a danger for their souls; terrified, he was prepared to abandon his writing and to sell his books.[64] Petrarch's task was both to relieve his friend's fears and to defend the study of literature. After questioning whether the prophecy was of divine origin and elaborating on the theme of fearlessly facing both death and life, Petrarch turned to the value for Christians of reading the pagans.

Initially, Petrarch's defense seemed largely to be that the rhetorical training furnished by ancient literature and history had provided the Church Fathers with the tools for defending the faith. Had Lactantius and Augustine refrained from such study, Petrarch declared, the former would have been unable to attack pagan superstition so effectively and the latter to construct his *City of God* so artfully. Moreover, had Jerome refrained from reading poetic, philosophical, oratorical, and historical literature, his work would never have had the crushing effect on heretical teachings that it had had.

Petrarch went further, however, to argue that ancient writings build moral character:

> We must not be scared away from literature either by the exhortation to virtue or by the pretext of approaching death. If literature is harbored in a good soul, it arouses a love of virtue and either removes or lessens the fear of death; if abandoned, it will suggest a suspicion of diffidence, which used to be the accusation against wisdom. Literature is not an obstacle, but rather helps a man of good character who masters it; it advances the journey of life, it does not delay it.[65]

---

[63] *Sen.* I.5, in *Le senili: Libro primo*, 36–66.

[64] To judge from Vittore Branca's characterization of Boccaccio's attitude in these years, *Boccaccio: The Man and His Works*, trans. R. Monges (New York, 1976), 128–49, I consider Boccaccio to be expressing genuine fear and not merely claiming to be terrified so as to offer Petrarch an opportunity to expound on the value of ancient letters.

[65] *Sen.* I.5, in *Le Senili: Libro primo*, 58; *Letters of Old Age*, 1:23. The Latin text reads: "Non sumus aut exhortatione virtutis aut vicine mortis obtentu a literis deterrendi, que, si in bonam animam sint recepte, et virtutis excitam amorem, et, aut tollunt metum mortis, aut minuunt. Ne, deserte, suspicionem diffidentie afferant, que sapientie querebatur! Neque enim impediunt litere, sed adiuvant bene moratum possessorem viteque viam promovent, non retardant."

Proof of literature's primary importance for virtue was that "all of our forefathers whom we wish to emulate" spent their lives studying it, and some even on their last day were reading and writing.

By contrast, when he treated the same issue in terms of his own experience, other considerations came into play that complicated Petrarch's exposition and rendered his justification problematic. In a letter of 1358 to a Florentine friend, Francesco Nelli, Petrarch starkly affirmed his desire to live out his life reading Christian literature. He continued to love Cicero and Virgil, Plato and Homer, but

> now something greater is at stake and I am more concerned with saving of my soul than with eloquence.[66]

His orators at present were Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory, and his philosopher was St. Paul. He had once been doubtful whether David was a greater poet than Homer or Virgil, but now experience and the light of truth left no doubt that David was "my poet" – note that he did not, however, specifically assert David's superiority. Then, by way of justifying so many of his labors, he continued:

> Not ... that I prefer the one group [Christian writers] and attach little value to the other [the pagan authors], as Jerome wrote that he did, even though he did not act upon his words in his later work, so far as I can judge. I, it appears, can love both sides at the same time, even though I know very well whom to prefer when it is a question of expression and whom when it is a question of substance.[67]

In more concrete terms:

> If I am to give an oration, I use Maro or Tullius, nor, if Latium seems lacking in some respect, will it be shameful to borrow from Greece. Although I have learned many useful things from their work, when it comes to leading my life, I use those advisers and guides whose faith and learning are not suspected of error.[68]

We have no way of determining to what extent these statements described actual practice and to what extent only good intention.

---

[66] *Rerum Fam.* XXII.10, in *Familiari* 4:127.

[67] *Rerum fam.* XXII.10, in *Familiari* 4:127–28. Oddly, Petrarch claims here that in his first eclogue in the *Bucolicum carmen* he had been unable to decide whether David or Virgil was the superior poet. The only possible lines he could have meant were bk. I, lines 55 ff., where David is praised, but there is no reference to Virgil or any other rival poet. See Bergin, *Bucolicum carmen*, 8.

[68] *Rerum fam.* XXIV.10, in *Familiari* 4:128.

The neatness of the distinction between pagan style and Christian substance certainly allowed no room for pagan *eloquentia*, which Petrarch usually considered a felicitous conjunction of form and content. Indeed, to apply consistently the division laid out here between the two components of learning would undercut Petrarch's justification for continuing work on projects of moral significance such as the *De viris illustribus*. While he here took a clearer position than usual on the issue of pagan letters, inconsistencies remained.

Petrarch's *On His Own Ignorance and That of Many Others*, a multilayered self-defense against four Aristotelian critics, constituted his most elaborate consideration of the Christian use of pagan letters. Wounded by four young men, supposedly his friends, who had branded him a good but ignorant man because he had disagreed with Aristotle on certain points, Petrarch resorted to a complex strategy to discredit both the accusation and the accusers. In passages charged with irony, he declared that he preferred to be judged a good rather than a wise man, because morality was superior to wisdom and love to truth. For the same reason, the Latin writers deserved to be ranked higher than Aristotle, whose moral teaching was ineffective.

> He [Aristotle] teaches what virtue is, I do not deny that; but his lesson lacks the words that sting and set afire and urge toward love of virtue and hatred of vice or, at any rate, does not have enough of such power. He who looks for that will find it in our Latin writers, especially in Cicero and Seneca, and, what may be astonishing to hear, in Horace, a poet somewhat rough in style but most pleasing in his maxims.[69]

Implicitly, humanist education based on those Latin authors was more directly relevant to the primary needs of mankind than was the Aristotelian curriculum offered by the Scholastics.[70]

Petrarch then identified the elements in Aristotle's thought, such as the theory of the eternity of the world, that clearly contradicted Christian faith. It was apparently Petrarch's criticism of Aristotle on points like these that had brought on the charge of ignorance:

---

[69] *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*, 744; "On his own ignorance," 104.

[70] Only fear of human punishment prevents Petrarch's critics from espousing the doctrine of the eternity of the world (732). As for what they call knowledge: "Nam quid, oro, naturas beluarum et volucrum et piscium et serpentum nosse profuerit, et naturam hominum, ad quid nati sumus, unde et quo pergimus, vel nescire vel spernere?" (ibid., 714).

> They [his young critics] believe that a man has no great intellect and is hardly learned unless he dares to raise his voice against God and to dispute against the Catholic Faith, silent before Aristotle alone.

Although limited to natural reason as they were, Plato and the Platonists had been far more successful in establishing truths about the nature of God and the soul. Cicero, too, expressed similar opinions in some of his works. But even the Platonists, while coming close to the truth, failed to reach it, and Cicero, if at points writing words seemingly inspired by Christian sentiments, remained unquestionably a pagan. Petrarch clearly intended here to dwarf the learning of all the ancients, not just that of Aristotle, by comparison with divinely revealed truth.

Having earlier stressed the value of the Latin writers as stimuli to moral reform, he now focused specifically on Cicero. Beginning with the minimalist position that, if read with "a pious and modest attitude," Cicero did no harm, Petrarch continued:

> He was profitable to everybody so far as eloquence is concerned, to many others as regards living. This is especially true in Augustine's case ....

Augustine had long training in using "the weapons of the enemy" before he became the great champion of the faith. So too, when it was a matter of eloquence,

> I confess, I admire Cicero as much or even more than all who wrote a line in any nation.

Again, as in the letter to Nelli, Petrarch tended to emphasize the stylistic contribution of the ancients in general, even though he singled out Cicero as having had a special effect on Augustine. Despite his undoubted admiration and even affection for Cicero, he counted that pagan among the enemy.

In one of the most dramatic statements found in any of his prose works, Petrarch analyzed the relationship between his love of Cicero and his Christian faith:

> If to admire Cicero means to be a Ciceronian then I am a Ciceronian. I admire him so much that I wonder at people who do not admire him. This may appear a new confession of my ignorance, for this is how I feel, such is my amazement. However, when we come to think or speak of religion, that is, of supreme truth and true happiness, and of eternal salvation, then I am certainly not a Ciceronian, or a Platonist, but a Christian ....[71]

[71] Ibid., 710; "On His Own Ignorance," 115.

He agreed with Augustine that, had Cicero known Christ and understood His teaching, he would have become a Christian. As for Plato, many Platonists, including Augustine himself, afterwards became Christian:

> If this fundament stands, in what way is Ciceronian eloquence opposed to the Christian dogma? ... Besides, any pious Catholic, however unlearned he may be, will find much more credit with me in this respect than would Plato or Cicero.[72]

In keeping with the dichotomy that he had maintained from the outset of the work between learning and morality, this stark declaration of preference for uninformed piety, while specifically referring only to religious belief, served to cast all pagan learning from whatever source into a position of inferiority.

The concluding sentence of Petrarch's statement, with its obscurantist implications, represented more than a rhetorical ploy intended to defy and even shame his adversaries. Designed to notify his critics that he was motivated by values diametrically opposed to theirs, the affirmation nonetheless failed to bring together all the lines of the argument. It certainly failed to explain the irritated undertone of slighted vanity running through the work. The reader is left to wonder: If the claims of religion are so pre-emptive, why devote so much of one's life to the writings of antiquity?

On balance, although the ideal of *docta pietas* modeled on that of the Church Fathers dominated his mature work, Petrarch's religious sensibilities were capable of wide swings. At times, driven by devotion or terror, he must have resumed the interrupted dialogue depicted in the *Secretum*, but probably never for long. The residue of his agonizing contacts with the Truth persisted, however, as a permanent ingredient in his thinking, and to a degree sufficient to generate an occasional treasonous remark against his own humanism.

Consciously, Petrarch aimed at effecting a harmony between two discordant notes. But in conceiving of humanism as founded on the study and imitation of the ancient authors with the goal of moral reform while at the same time attempting to set moral standards by the dictates of Christian piety, he endowed the humanist movement with a mission fraught with contradiction and ambivalence. Because

[72] The last sentence reads: "Ceterum multo hac in parte plus fidei apud me habiturus fuerit pius quisque catholicus, quamvis indoctus, quam Plato ipse vel Cicero."

occasions of direct confrontation between pagan and Christian were relatively rare in his writings, however – I have discussed most of them – Petrarch's ethical meditations remained largely untrammeled by pious restrictions. Read in fragmentary fashion, his work could provide models of conduct for laymen and clerics alike.

Common to all of Petrarch's ethical conceptions was their individualistic focus. Detached from their communal setting, humanist ethics in Petrarch's hands became at once cosmopolitan and personal, with a corresponding diminution in their civic orientation. The writings of Coluccio Salutati in the next generation testify to the strains and stresses encountered by a scholar, intimately conversant with Petrarch's corpus of writings, who tried to adapt Petrarchan humanism to an Italian communal milieu. As for the international aspect of the movement, whatever response Petrarch had evoked in his non-Italian admirers could not yet be self-sustaining, and with the passing of Salutati, new trends in Italian humanism no longer spoke to the predominately clerical intelligentsia of northern Europe. Admittedly, other elements were involved, such as preoccupation with conciliar reform, but the rerouting of much of humanism to its former paths after 1400 was the major cause of the more than fifty years' hiatus in intensive contacts between Italian humanists and northern thinkers.

3

We have seen that the best poetry of Lovato and Mussato went beyond reproductive or eclectic imitation of its subtexts to evoke the presence of the model or models imitated.[73] Even more than Lovato, Petrarch at his best created a dialogue between his poetic composition and the ancient original that reflected the historical contingency

[73] Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven and London, 1982), 86, calls this "metaphoric intertextuality." He contrasts this form of intertextuality, characteristic of Renaissance imitation, with medieval metonymic intertextuality. As I understand his argument, the Middle Ages considered the ancient text as never completed, never the whole text, and as always capable of manipulation by contemporary authors. Because never "finished," ancient works could not be considered historical artifacts. For the Renaissance, the ancient text was a finished work, and the modern work, while signifying itself, also signified its ancient model.

of both constructions by highlighting lexical, emotional, and contextual disparities between the two. At the same time, by building links between his own poetry and its ancient subtexts, Petrarch embroidered his work with a constellation of classical associations.

His extensive description of the valley of the Vaucluse in *Epist. Met.* I.4, for example, does just that. With its series of images of the natural beauties of the area, the opening draws on the bucolic tradition of ancient Latin literature through what has been referred to as "generic imitation":

> Si nichil aut gelidi facies nitidissima fontis
> Aut nemorum convexa cavis archana latebris
> At placidis bene nota feris Dryadumque cathervis
> Et Faunis accepta domus, nichil ista poetis
> Oportuna sacris sub apricis rupibus antra
> Permulcent animum .... [74]

So skillfully has Petrarch blended the influences derived from his various ancient sources here that no single text or set of texts can be identified as the model for his description. By endowing his Provençal landscape with a classical aura through mythological associations and pagan tropes such as the *sacri poeti*, he evokes nostalgia for the lost world enshrined in ancient bucolic poetry. Such generic imitation points up the temporal limitations both of Petrarch's poem and of its model, highlighting the insurmountable gulf of time between them.

In an early letter, Petrarch described the creative process as essentially involving imitation and, inspired by Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 84, he likened it to the work of bees making honey:

> His [Seneca's] loftiest advice about invention is to imitate the bees which through an astonishing process produce wax and honey from the flowers they leave behind.... This much however I affirm, that it is a sign of greater elegance and skill for us, in imitation of the bees, to produce in our own words thoughts borrowed from others. To repeat, let us write neither in the style of one or another writer; but in a style uniquely ours although gathered from a variety of sources.[75]

[74] This example is taken from Ugo Dotti, "La formazione dell'umanesimo nel Petrarca: Le *Epistole metriche*," *Belfagor* 23 (1968): 542–43. The English translation reads: "If the limpid surface of the icy spring does not attract your soul, or the secret shadows of the woods hidden in the hollows, but well-known to the peaceful wild animals and pleasing to the troops of dryads and fauns; and those caves that open under sunny rocks and lend themselves so well to sacred poets ...."

While that writer was "happier" who could generate eloquence independently of other writers, "none" – and for the sake of caution he added "or very few" – could do so, nor did he count himself among the few who could.

As preparation for our own creative activity, consequently, we must steep ourselves in the writings of the great authors "as though we were alighting upon the white lilies." Not merely the content of the great authors' work, but the aural effects they achieved, "the soft sound," contributed to the honey we distilled within ourselves.[76] But he cautioned his correspondent to

> Be careful not to let any of those things that you have plucked remain with you too long, for the bees would enjoy no glory if they did not transform those things they found into something else which was better. You also, if you find anything of value in your desire for reading and meditating, I urge you to convert it into honey combs through your own style.[77]

In a letter to Boccaccio, probably written in 1359, Petrarch admitted that, because of his long absorption in the writings of ancient authors, they had become part of him:

> They have become absorbed into my being and implanted not only in my memory but in the marrow of my bones, and have become one with my mind so that even if I never read them [Virgil, Horace, Boethius, and Cicero] again in my life, they would inhere in me with their roots sunk in the depths of my soul.[78]

---

[75] *Rerum fam.* I.8, in *Familiari* 1:39–40 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:41–42 (English). On Petrarch's theory of imitation, see especially Hermann Gmelin, "Das Prinzip der *Imitatio* in den romanischen Literaturen der Renaissance," *Romanische Forschungen* 46 (1932): 98–173; and Greene, *Light in Troy*, 81–146. Seneca was not alone among classical writers in recommending an eclectic style. See Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae* I, praef. 6; and Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, X.2:23–26. The approach was also common in the Middle Ages: see Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova*, lines 1837–46, ed. E. Gallo, in *The Poetria Nova and Its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrine* (The Hague and Paris, 1971), 112; and references in Peter von Moos, *Hildebert von Lavardin, 1056–1133: Humanitas an der Schwelle des höfischen Zeitalters*, Pariser Historische Studien, no. 3 (Stuttgart, 1965), 40. Cicero, however, opposed the eclectic tendency (*De oratore* II.21.89–23.96).

[76] *Rerum fam.* I.8, in *Familiari* 1:43 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:45 (English).

[77] *Rerum fam.* I.8, in *Familiari* 1:44 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:46 (English).

[78] (*Rerum fam.* XXII.2, in *Familiari* 4:106: "Hec se michi tam familiariter ingessere et non modo memorie sed medulis affixa sunt unumque cum ingenio facta sunt meo, ut etsi per omnem vitam amplius non legantur, ipsa quidem hereant, actis in intima animi parte radicibus." Translation mine. I have already cited this passage in ch. 1 as an indication of the powerful cognitive effect that intense study and imitation of the ancient authors produced.

Nonetheless, he asserted, he never copied their work intentionally. Whenever he consciously borrowed words from an author, he cited the original source or made a significant change so that the words became his own.

> I much prefer that my own style be my own, uncultivated and rude, but made to fit, as a garment, to the measure of my mind, rather than to someone else's, which may be more elegant, ambitious, and adorned, but one that, deriving from a greater genius, continually slips off, unfitted to the humble proportions of my intellect.... Surely each of us naturally possesses something individual and personal in his voice and speech, as well as in his looks and gestures, that is easier, more useful, and more rewarding to cultivate and correct than to change.[79]

Because style was the reflection of the individual personality, slavish imitation of another constituted a betrayal of oneself and an invitation to ridicule.

Petrarch's most elaborate formulation of his theory of *imitatio* occurs in another letter to Boccaccio, probably written six or seven years after the preceding one. Describing the poetic bent of his young amanuensis, Giovanni Malpaghini, Petrarch characterized the boy's attempt to imitate Virgil as so fervent that he had gone to the extent of inserting fragments of the Roman poet's lines into his own work. He had done so in such an unsophisticated fashion, however, that the original was easily identifiable. Unlike a painter, who seeks a true representation of the original in his art, a writer should conceive of his imitation of another author as similar to a son's imitation of a father.

> While often very different in their individual features, they have a certain something our painters call an "air," especially noticeable about the face and eyes, that produces a resemblance; seeing the son's face, we are reminded of the father's, although if it came to measurement, the features would all be different, but there is something subtle that creates this effect. We must thus see to it that if there is something similar, there is also a great deal that is dissimilar, and that the similar be elusive and inextricable except in silent meditation, for the resemblance is to be felt rather than expressed. Thus we may appropriate another's ideas as well as his coloring but we must abstain from his actual words; for, with the

[79] *Rerum fam.* XXII.2, in *Familiari* 4:106–07 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 3:213 (English).

> former, resemblance remains hidden, and with the latter it is glaring: the former creates poets, the second apes.[80]

Imitation, therefore, constituted a form of dissimulation or paraphrase by which, like the bee, the writer transformed the words and voices of ancient authors into his own "honeycombs" through the chemistry of his talent. Here again, in formulating an account of imitation, Petrarch was a pioneer. Whatever Mussato and other earlier humanists thought they were striving to achieve in their efforts to imitate ancient models must be reconstructed from their practice; nowhere does any of them articulate a theory of imitation.

Petrarch made no distinction between the uses of imitation in poetry and prose. By 1350, however, imitation of Latin authors in prose had become his primary outlet.[81] As he industriously added to his *Rerum familiarium*, inventing many of the "earlier" letters to fill out the collection, his production of letters for *Epistole metrice* declined, the latest probably being composed in 1355. Although by implication predating the actual change, he basically told the truth, as far as Latin poetry was concerned, when, in 1362, he wrote to Boccaccio that "we put aside [writing poetry] so long ago."[82] In any case, the influence of Petrarch's theory of imitation had greater consequences for the immediate development of Latin prose than for that of Latin poetry.

Petrarch developed his prose style in contradistinction to two of the dominant stylistic languages of his day, *ars dictaminis* and scholastic Latin. He made his position on *ars dictaminis*'s monopoly on letter writing perfectly clear in the dedicatory letter of his *Rerum familiarium*, in which he directly attacked the oratorical conception informing the medieval letter.[83] Perhaps he had some knowledge of Geri d'Arezzo's collection of correspondence, but by this time he certainly had at his disposition Cicero's *Ad Atticum*, an authoritative source sufficient to

---

[80] *Rerum fam.* XXIII.19, in *Familiari* 4:206 (Latin) and Familiar Letters 3:301–02 (English). Joanna Woods-Marsden, "'Ritratto al Naturale': Questions of Realism and Idealism in Early Renaissance Portraits," *Art Journal* 46 (1987): 209–16, undercuts Petrarch's assessment of the actual practice of imitation in Renaissance painting.

[81] Dotti, "La formazione dell'Umanesimo nel Petrarca," 537, points out that after 1350 Petrarch probably wrote no more than ten letters in Latin verse. The last appears to have been that sent to Zanobi da Strada in 1355 (*Epist metr.* III.9).

[82] *Sen.* 1.5, in *Le Senili: Libro primo*, 62; *Letters of Old Age*, 1:25. Petrarch refers to his interest in poetry as "studia hec, que pridem post tergum liquimuus."

[83] For a detailed analysis of the letters and of Petrarch's conflicting judgments regarding his purpose for collecting them, see Najemy, *Between Friends*, 26–30.

encourage him to write in "a temperate type of speech."[84] While the Roman had superb oratorical talents, Cicero chose an "equable" style for his private correspondence. "Therefore," Petrarch wrote to van Kempen, his "Socrates," to whom he dedicated the work,

> you will enjoy, as you have my other writings, this plain, domestic and friendly style, forgetting that rhetorical power of speech which I neither lack nor abound in and which if I did abound in I would not know where to exercise.[85]

Petrarch intended more by this than simply reducing the stylistic register of his prose to *stilus humilis*. He was restoring the conception of the private letter as a freewheeling vehicle for communicating the writer's feelings and thoughts, a concept lost with the triumph of *ars dictaminis*; and he was forging a new language to that end. Geri may have been the pioneer in this endeavor, but probably his innovation, like those of other pre-Petrarchan humanists, lacked the theoretical elaboration that would have given it programmatic status. In terms of historical impact, credit for reforming the European private letter belongs to Petrarch in his *Rerum familiarium*.

Despite his belief in the potential efficacy of his language, Petrarch could not have been unaware that the difficulty of his prose style would be an obstacle to its influence. As with the writings of Mussato, those of Petrarch necessarily demanded an acquaintance with ancient prose that contemporary schools did not provide. Although Pope Clement VI wanted Petrarch as his secretary, he and other members of the curia feared that, as Petrarch reported it bemusedly, "my style might be too lofty for the humility required of the Roman See."[86] Petrarch claimed that he in no way wanted the position and had agreed to consider curial employment only out of deference to the wishes of his friends. Accordingly, when requested to write an official letter as a test of the suitability of his style, he saw his way out:

> As soon as they gave me a subject on which to write, I unfurled the wings of my feeble talent, making every effort to rise far above the earth. As Ennius and after him Maro state, I flew so high as not to be

[84] This whole passage is important (*Rerum fam.* I.1, in *Familiari* 1:6): "Nulla hic equidem magna vis dicendi; quippe que nec michi adest, et quam, si plane afforet, stilus iste non recipit; ut quam nec Cicero ipse, in ea facultate prestantissimus, epistolis suis inseruit certe, nec libris in quibus est 'equabile' quoddam, ut ipse ait, 'et temperatum orationis genus.'"

[85] *Rerum fam.* I.1, in *Familiari* 1:6 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 1:6–7 (English).

[86] *Rerum fam.* XIII.5 in *Familiari* 3:68 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 2:189 (English).

> seen, if that were possible, by those who had led me into captivity. You would think that the Muses were present, although it was hardly a Pierian labor, and that our Apollo was giving me protection. What I had written was considered insufficiently intelligible to most of them, although it was really very clear; by some, it was viewed as Greek or some barbarian tongue. Imagine the kind of men in charge of the highest matters![87]

Petrarch probably had no interest in the secretaryship, but, in order to dampen enthusiasm for his appointment, would he have gone so far as intentionally to write his sample letter in an obscure style? Like almost every other educated man in France or Italy, Petrarch had studied *ars dictaminis* and knew perfectly well how to satisfy curial stylistic standards. The official Milanese *missive* sent to the French king in 1358 was almost certainly Petrarch's work and displays a mastery of the genre.[88] But in the present instance he refused to follow tradition. He may have insisted that the letter "was really very clear," but he knew very well that not only did his classicizing Latin ignore the traditional diplomatic codes of *ars dictaminis*, but even those at the curia who were considered experienced Latinists would have had difficulty in reading his prose without a commentary.

He freely acknowledged the difficulties of his style and the demands it made of the reader:

> It gives me pleasure to be noticed by few men: and the fewer they are, the more I take pride in myself.[89]

His compositions require the full attention of the reader:

> I refuse to have him simultaneously carry on his business and study; I refuse to allow him to learn without labor what I wrote with labor.

---

[87] *Rerum fam.* XIII.5, in *Familiari* 3:69 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 2:189–190 (English) (slightly emended). The Latin reads: "... ut primum dictandi materia data est, omni nisu ingenioli mei alas explicui quibus me humo tollerem, ut ait Ennius et post eum Maro, et alte adeo volarem ut si fieri posset, ab his qui me captum ducebant, non viderer. Affuisse Musas, quanquam minime pyerium opus esset, et nostrum favisse putes Apollinem: quod dictaveram magne parti non satis intelligibile, cum tamen esset apertissimum, quibusdam vero grecum seu mage barbaricum visum est: en quibus ingeniis rerum summa committitur."

[88] See the official letters written for Galeazzo and Bernabò Visconti between 1356 and 1359: *Lettere disperse: Varie e miscellanee*, ed. A. Pancheri (Parma, 1994), 280–314. Probably a painful concession to his Visconti patrons, the letters do not undercut the sincerity of Petrarch's rejection of *dictamen* style.

[89] *Rerum fam.* XIII.5, in *Familiari* 3:71 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 2:191 (English).

Probably here Petrarch was referring not merely to the content of his work but also to the formal aspects of its presentation. He had taken great pains with constructing his prose and the reader should expect to invest time in understanding what he had written.[90]

Petrarch's ambitious program of reform, by its very faith in the intimate relationship between eloquence and virtue, inevitably led to a confrontation with another form of prose expression, that of the scholastic intellectual elite. A highly technical language designed to achieve maximum precision in thinking, scholastic Latin by the fourteenth century reflected three hundred years of effort by scholars, pushing against the limits allowed by the Christian faith, to conceptualize God and created nature by using human reason.

According to Petrarch, the Scholastics were mistaken to take rationality as the major active force in human beings and to deal with moral issues in abstract terms, using dialectical arguments intended to convince by their logical soundness. In contrast, accentuating Augustine's focus on the will, Petrarch saw in the rhetorician's traditional awareness of the character of each audience an assumption of the uniqueness of the individual human being.[91] Not only did he design his humanistic program of reform in accordance with that insight, but he also encouraged individual self-awareness through his theory of stylistic imitation. Stylistic and moral reform were of a piece. Petrarch was driven to attack scholastic language, which was incapable of conveying his vision of human nature. He restated ethical issues, often in terms of his own inner conflicts and always in a personal voice, so as to establish a degree of intimacy with the reader, provoke his interest, and encourage him to examine his comportment.

That Petrarch's diction proved just as arcane to Scholastics as to traditional rhetoricians is shown by the complaint of obscurity lodged

[90] Ibid.

[91] In his *Tractatus virtutum*, Biblioteca vallicelliana Rome, C.40, fol. 8, Boncompagno warns the reader to adjust his rhetoric to the audience: "Item virtus est ut diligentissime consideret dictator quid, cui, quando, ubi et quomodo loquatur. Oportet enim dictatorem se omnium moribus informare. Aliter enim est domino pape, aliter clericus, aliter laicis aliter viris, aliter mulieribus, aliter liberis, aliter servis. Et in super quod maius est, debet providus dictator considerare virtutes et vitia uniuscuiusque persone si fieri potest, quia multotiens quod uni placet, alteri abhorret et quedam adiectiva possunt poni ad laudem unius quae ad alterius vituperium si ponerentur spectarent."

against him in 1352 by one of his highly placed correspondents, Cardinal Talleyrand, a man well-trained in law and natural science. The cardinal's letter has not survived; Petrarch's reply constitutes a response to his correspondent's accusation that in a previous letter Petrarch's style made his meaning difficult to grasp:

> You bid me be clear in my style; and I am indeed disposed to obey you in all things. But we are clearly not in agreement on one point, since you call clear the style that skims the ground and I consider clear that which flies higher, provided it does not become enveloped in clouds.[92]

Implicitly recognizing the suitability of the cardinal's scholastic language for certain materials, Petrarch conceded that were his own style to "pursue the intricate path of rational philosophy or the hidden one of natural philosophy," there would be reason for confusion, but when dealing with moral issues, issues common to the experience of everyone, there could be no difficulties of comprehension.

After discussing the dangers and annoyances of great wealth and high office, Petrarch returned in the last lines of the letter to his correspondent's concern about the difficulty of his style. Intentionally he confused the issue. The cardinal's complaint had been that Petrarch's style rendered the content of his letters obscure. But ignoring this objection, Petrarch concluded the letter by making a distinction between content and form based on his earlier assertion in the letter that moral issues were within the comprehension of all:

> You be the judge of this letter's style; the content is without doubt clear; therefore even if you do not approve of the style, you will not condemn the content.[93]

From the cardinal's point of view, the distinction was irrelevant. In-

[92] *Rerum fam.* XIV.1, in *Familiari* 3:95 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 2:216 (English). Petrarch indicated that the cardinal's literary training was weak: "Etsi enim propter innumerabiles et altissimas occupationes tuas tibi familiaris esse nequiverit, magnus tamen vir Virgilius, ingenio inter primos, nulli secundus eloquio, et quem si degustare ceperis, forsan dulcedine capiaris doleasque non ante tibi cognitum": (*Rerum fam.* XIV.1, in *Familiari* 3:99). Writing to Ludwig von Kempen (Socrates), whom he expected to deliver the letter to Talleyrand, Petrarch explained that he had endeavored to please the cardinal by using a style congenial to him: "Nunc vero longe ac fervide illius instantie in eo quod me clarum fieri voluit, aliquando sic parui, ut verear ne sibi nimis obtemperatum dicat" (ibid., XIV.2, in *Familiari* 3:108). The style of his letter to the cardinal indicates no effort to simplify his diction.

[93] Ibid., XIV.1, in *Familiari* 3:105 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 2:225 (English).

deed, we would expect that this second letter proved just as difficult for its recipient to understand as had the first.

Petrarch knew what he was doing. The intended audience for this letter was not its actual recipient, but those few of his generation and – he hoped – the many of later generations who would be able to understand his Latin and appreciate his pioneering effort to create or rather re-create a language capable of expressing moral ideals and stirring men to ethical reform. The failure of his writing test at the curia and the interchange with Talleyrand, however, show that resistance to Petrarch's innovative Latin style came not only because the users of *ars dictaminis* and scholastic Latin believed that the traditional styles were the best, but also because of the simple fact that even learned Latin readers had difficulty parsing specimens of the new prose model.

While Petrarch vehemently rejected both *dictamen* and scholastic Latin as appropriate languages for his use, how did he in fact reconcile his desire to imitate ancient Latin prose with his need to create his own distinctive Latin voice? First of all, as I have suggested earlier, the task of defining the stylistic aspects of ancient prose proved far more difficult than it had in the case of poetry. Not only did Petrarch's poetic writing benefit from the cohesive canon of the classical poets, centuries of northern European grammarians' comments on the language of individual pagan poets, and schoolroom use of poetry to illustrate *colores rhetorici*, but the techniques of creating stylistic effects in poetic genres such as bucolic and love lyric were easier to isolate than those for the prose epistle or the moral treatise. Further, poetic composition enjoyed greater license and thus was more open to reform than prose, especially genres like letter writing and the oration, which were dominated by the standards of official rhetoric that were taught in the schools.

The attainment of a level of classical diction in prose first of all required a profile of stylistic constructions of different ancient writers similar to that available for poetry and then, because of the greater need for control over syntax in prose, some awareness of historical changes in Latin usage. Equipped with knowledge of a range of differing styles seen within the context of an epoch in the history of Latin grammar, the humanist could then intelligently locate himself vis-à-vis the past and define the distance that he wished to keep between his own style and that of the author or period he intended to imitate. Although humanists would debate the merits of one model

against another, the overall result would be the narrowing of the canon of authors considered suitable for imitation.

Petrarch's idea of confecting his style from the most congenial aspects of pagan writing, however, militated against an in-depth inspection of individual styles. Furthermore, Petrarch had no conception of language as a developing constellation of verbal practices: style for him was solely a matter of individual achievement.[94] While he had certain ingredients of a historical approach to language – he considered Cicero the acme of ancient eloquence and the Latin of the Middle Ages a great falling away from ancient standards – he had no idea of a "classical style" and tended to envisage a wide range of pagan authors and Christian writers at least down to Augustine as potential models for imitation.

Because ancient Latin retained an amorphous character for him, he felt little compunction about using words and locutions of biblical and ecclesiastical origin, together with biblical citations to articulate his Christian humanism. By combining pagan and Christian language, he forged a prose style capable of dealing broadly with issues confronting contemporary Christian society; at the same time, his success at intermingling languages delayed the process of classicizing. Bruni's Ciceronianism was to create the opposite problem: how to express specifically Christian ideas and concerns without compromising classical usages.

Two sorts of decisions that Petrarch made also worked against the classicizing tendency of his Latin.[95] As a literary artist, Petrarch at points in his writing was confronted with having to choose between what he knew to be a classical word, usage, or word arrangement and another which, if employed, would better achieve a particular aural

[94] On Petrarch's view of the immutability of language, see my *Hercules*, 263–66. All the same, Petrarch appears to accept the status of language as a matter of convention (ibid., 265). Cino Rinuccini, ca. 1405–06, indicates that by this point Florentines were aware of changes in grammar over time (ibid., 270). Valla pointed to the historicity of language in his effort to establish his recommendations regarding the best Latin usages for his own day: Salvatore Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla: Umanesimo e teologia* (Florence, 1972), 187–92.

[95] These remarks are not intended to denigrate Petrarch's style, but rather to point out that, seen from a late-fifteenth-century perspective, Petrarch had only a vague notion of linguistic changes in ancient Latin between one generation and another or of the qualitative difference in style over the generations. Ancient Latin for him was one language, consisting of a variety of styles, and the chronological parameters of "ancient" were ill-defined.

effect. While he often resisted the temptation and chose the classical, at other times he conceded to the medieval.[96]

More significant for Petrarch's considered use of classicizing style was his rhetorician's sense of appropriateness, which led him to adjust his Latin to the audience he addressed. For this reason, his prose style varied widely. Perhaps it had its most classicizing form in the *De viris illustribus* and its least in his devout work, *De otio religioso*, addressed to monks in his brother's monastery. Several periods selected from each work suffice to illustrate the divide.

At the opening of chapter 3 of the *De viris illustribus*, the life of Scipio Africanus, Petrarch writes:

> Sic Hispanie, per Scipionem quinto anno postquam ad eas venerat composite et iugo Carthaginensium erepte, quatuor eorum exercitibus et totidem ducibus fugatis cesis captis, ad romanum imperium rediere. Que quamvis merito magna omnibus viderentur, illi soli a quo gesta erant perexigua et gerendorum quedam quasi preludia videbantur animo Africam magnamque Carthaginem iam volventi.[97]

The first, short but tightly woven periodic sentence sets the place and time: the subject (*Hispanie*), followed by two participial clauses (*composite* and *erepte*), the first of which itself includes a temporal clause (*postquam*); then an ablative absolute based on three past participles (*fugatis*, *cesis*, and *captis*) without conjunctions (asyndeton), and finally

[96] Stylistic concerns were uppermost in Petrarch's mind when deciding the use of words or syntax: Guido Martellotti, "Latinità del Petrarca," in *Scritti petrarcheschi*, ed. M. Feo and S. Rizzo, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 16 (Padua, 1983), 291–92. While he recognized the decadence of Latin literature after the end of antiquity "esso [decadence] non è della lingua latina, bensì del costume letterario; ed è questo costume che il Petrarca intende ristabilire." Petrarch's acceptance of the late-ancient grammarian Priscian as *princeps grammaticorum* blurred the difference between medieval and ancient grammatical usage. After a detailed study of *Rerum familiarium*, Sylvia Rizzo, "Il latino di Petrarca," in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, ed. A.C. Dionisotti, A. Grafton, and J. Kraye, Warburg Institute, Surveys and Texts, no. 16 (London, 1988), 54, concludes that in cases of conflict Petrarch tended to choose classical usage. She hesitates to say to what extent the choice was conscious. Her article provides an excellent bibliography on studies of Petrarch's Latin (56). See also her "Il latino del Petrarca e il latino dell'umanesimo," 349–62, with additions to the bibliography on Petrarch's Latin, 354, n. 12.

[97] Petrarch, *Prose*, 236: "Thus Scipio pacified Spain four years after coming there and wrenched it from the yoke of the Carthaginians. Having destroyed four armies and as many generals with flight, death, and capture, he restored the country to the empire. Although these deeds seemed impressive to all, to him alone who had accomplished them they appeared slight, and to his mind already thinking of Africa and Carthage, they were like a prelude of those to be accomplished." Note that *magna Carthago* is the mother city Carthage in contrast to Cartagena in Spain.

the main verb in the historical tense (*rediere*). The second sentence centers on the verb *video*, set in the imperfect passive subjunctive (*viderentur*) in a concessive clause (*quamvis*), and the imperfect passive indicative *videbantur*, main verb for the two main clauses linked by *et*. *Magna* and its contrary *perexigua* respectively modify the relative pronoun *que* in the concessive clause and in the first of the main clauses, while in the second main clause, *que* is identified with *preludia*. The datives, *omnibus* + subjunctive, and *illi solo* + indicative, set the public's opinion in contrast to Scipio's own opinion; by synecdochic substitution of *animo volenti* for *illi* in the final clause, Petrarch distills the intensity of the hero's ambition – but, by leaving a participle hanging at the end of the sentence, he has produced a weak sentence.

Admittedly, of prose genres, ancient historical writing was, along with oration, the easiest to define for purposes of imitation, and in Mussato, Petrarch already had had a predecessor. But more important in explaining the classicism of this passage, I believe, is that Petrarch felt unhampered by any religious scruples: classicizing style was utterly appropriate for celebrating the life of an ancient pagan hero.

In contrast, the opening lines of Petrarch's *De otio religioso*, following a short preface, reflect a very different Petrarch:

> Unde vero nunc ordiar, seu quid primum semiabsens dicam, nisi quod totus presens dicere volui, illud nempe daviticum: "Vacate et videte," quod, ut nostis, in psalmo quarto et quadragesimo regius propheta et propheticus ille rex posuit? In quibus quidem nonnisi duobus sed imperativis verbis spiritu Dei licet hominis ore prolatis, totius nisi fallor vite vestre series, tota spes, tota denique continetur intentio finisque ultimus, quicquid agendum, quicquid optandum sperandumque vobis est in vita non solum transitoria sed eterna.
>
> "Vacate igitur et videte."[98]

The passage's loose structure, with almost no clausal subordination, does not mean that the sentences are any less carefully constructed

[98] "But where now should I begin, or what should I say first since I am only partly with you? What else but that saying of David, which I wanted to cite when I was entirely with you: 'Take time and see [that I am God].' As you know, that kingly prophet and prophetic king said this in the forty-fourth psalm. Unless I am mistaken, in two authoritative words of command, only two in number, spoken by the spirit of God, albeit through the mouth of a man, are contained the course of your whole life, all your hope, and your final destiny, whatever you must do, whatever you must wish and hope not only in this transient life but in eternity. Take time, therefore, and see!" (*De otio religioso*, 2).

than in the previous passage. Petrarch prepared the reader for the quotation by invoking it implicitly in three opening clauses, (*unde ... ordiar*, *quid ... dicam* and *quod ... volui*); he provided contrasts by placing the phrases *spiritu Dei* and *hominis ore* on either side of *licet* and by the use of chiasmus with *regius propheta* and *propheticus ... rex*. The second enunciation of the quotation is solemnly introduced by use of anaphora in two extended and redundant series of *incisa*: *totius ... vite series*, *tota spes*, *tota ... intentio finisque*; and *quicquid agendum*, *quicquid optandum*, [*quicquid*] *sperandum*.[99]

The repetitious, essentially paratactic construction of this passage suggests that Petrarch intended the *De otio* to be read aloud from the refectory lectern.[100] Grammatically correct, it lacks distinctive classicizing: a person used to contemporary Latin sermons would have had no problem following the speaker's thought and would have relished the ornamentation. Thus, Petrarch's stylistic practices in particular works are not simply functions of the extent of his understanding of ancient usages but also reflect authorial choices, based on considerations of audience and artistic effect.

The frequency of *cursus* in Petrarch's writings appears to vary with the degree of freedom he felt he had to innovate. His use of the regular meters of *cursus* in the *De viris illustribus* (52 per cent), like da Cermenate's (41.5 per cent) and Mussato's (59.0 per cent), suggests that he was not writing with the *cursus* in mind. The percentage of *cursus* in his *Rerum familiarium* (69 per cent), however, is substantially higher and probably reflects his selective use of meter when writing in the genre for which the *cursus* had initially been designed.[101]

---

[99] Note as well *transitoria*, from ecclesiastical Latin, in the penultimate line.

[100] Especially the use of anacoluthon in the opening lines (*unde ... ordiar* cannot have *illum ... daviticum* as direct object as do the other two verbs) suggests impromptu, oral delivery.

[101] Ugo E. Paoli, *Prose e poesie latine di scrittori italiani* (Florence, 1930), 23, describes Petrarch's style briefly as follows: "Nel complesso come scelta di parole e di locuzioni, come costruzioni sintattiche e attegiamenti stilistici il suo latino, raffrontato al latino classico, appare generalmente corretto e preciso." Paul Hazard, "Étude sur la latinité de Pétrarque d'après le livre 24 des *Epistolae familiares*," *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 24 (1904): 219–46, offers a similar opinion.

A good deal of scholarly attention has focused on Petrarch's use of *cursus*, especially in the correspondence. Scholars have concluded that *cursus* is relatively rare there. On Petrarch's use of *cursus*, see E.G. Parodi, "Intorno al testo delle epistole di Dante e al cursus," *Bullettino della società dantesca italiana*, n.s., 19 (1912): 151 and 157; E. Raimondi, "Correzioni medioevali, correzioni umanistiche e correzioni petrarchesche nella lettera VI del libro XVI delle *Familiares*," *Studi petrarcheschi* 1 (1948): 125–

There can be no question that generally Petrarch sought to capture his personal version of *vetustas* in his writings and that from the standpoint of early-fifteenth-century stylists his realizations fell short of the mark. Petrarch's *Rerum familiarium*, perhaps the most important work in terms of the future of humanism, shows the disparity more clearly than any of his other writings. Despite the fact that the discovery of Cicero's letters prompted Petrarch to collect his own correspondence, the attitudes and sententious tone of Petrarch's letters shows the overwhelming influence of Seneca's *Ad Lucilum epistulae morales*. For example, in the case of *Rerum familiarium* I.9, cited at length above, Seneca's letters 114 and 115 served as something like a palimpsest for large sections. As the editor's notes to the discussion of Petrarch's letter show, he not only borrowed thematic material – for instance, Seneca's affirmation of the ceaseless human pursuit of knowledge and virtue – but also derived inspiration for specific phrasing of his ideas. Nevertheless, despite the duplication of ideas and the reformulation of Seneca's words, Petrarch's tireless pursuit of "the intimate mysteries of truth" failed to evoke the Senecan text aesthetically in either a heuristic or a generic sense. Eloquent and thoughtful in itself, Petrarch's letter gestured toward the ancient world, but it failed to underwrite his own statement with the signature of the ancient author.

33; M. Boni's review of P. Ricci's edition of *Invectiva contra quendam magni status hominem sed nullius scientie aut virtutis* (Florence, 1950), *Studi petrarcheschi* 3 (1950): 242–45; and G. Martellotti, "Clausole e ritmi nella prosa narrativa del Petrarca," in *Scritti petrarcheschi*, 207–19.

In the appendix, I have defined the standard *cursus* and given the incidence of *cursus* in the *De viris* and the *Rerum familiarium* in comparison to other authors from Rolandino to Bruni. My conclusion is that the incidence of *cursus* in Petrarch's letters is relatively high and reflects conscious albeit selective use of *cursus*. Gudrun Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus: Seine Entwicklung und sein Abklingen in der Briefliteratur Italiens*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, no. 10 (Stockholm and Uppsala, 1963), 88–109, who has studied sections of the *Rerum familiarium*, and concludes that the incidence of *cursus* in Petrarch's correspondence was 73.0 per cent. As I explain in the appendix, my figure of 69.5 per cent is lower because based on a stricter interpretation of the *cursus* as defined by contemporary manuals. Contrary to my statistics, Guido Martellotti, "Clausole e ritmi nella prosa narrativa del Petrarca," 218–19, believes that the rate of *cursus* is higher in the *De viris* than in the letters, but standard *cursus* in that work is only 52 per cent. Were we to count endings in *trispondiacus* and *cursus medius* (e.g., *nóstri dómini*) among others, he might well be right. Were we to add the percentage of endings in *trispondiacus* to our statistics on the *De viris* and the *Rerum familiarium*, for instance, the total percentage for *cursus* in the *De viris* would be 71.5 per cent and 77.5 per cent for the *Rerum familiarium*, but the percentage for the correspondence still remains higher.

By focusing on the need for a personal style and encouraging his followers to combine in their own prose features that they found congenial from a variety of ancient sources, Petrarch in effect discouraged them from investigating the stylistic integrity of individual ancient writers. As a result, it may even be argued that he retarded the development of a sense of the historicity of the Latin language. Furthermore, by blurring the lines between vocabularies and, inevitably, between the sets of linguistic conventions to which they belonged historically, he offered a linguistic space that invited a humanist like Coluccio Salutati, when dealing with philosophical and theological topics, to employ scholastic words, phrases, and even formal constructions of argumentation without a bad conscience. Only the gradual fixing of a classical lexicon and syntax and a comparative understanding of stylistic characteristics of various pagan writers permitted a clear understanding of the linguistic changes that occurred from early to late antiquity.

Looked at another way, however, Petrarch contributed enormously to the process of classicizing. If most of what he wrote did not reach a level of heuristic or generic imitation, some of his poetry and historical writings had the potential for being models of classicizing for his followers. More important, by his determined effort to gauge his diction by great authors of antiquity and to break through the codes of medieval *ars dictaminis* and Scholasticism, Petrarch extended the range of prose composition susceptible to ancient stylistic influence to include all the major prose genres except oratory and the public letter. His incessant pursuit of lost ancient writings widened contemporary understanding of literature and history and destabilized traditional attitudes toward the ancient corpus.[102] Finally, as we shall see, his emphasis on ancient Roman history served to tie individual styles to historical personalities, a connection basic to the construction of historical periods of linguistic development.

[102] The literature on Petrarch's knowledge of the classics is enormous. Still valuable are Pierre de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme* (Paris, 1892), and Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, especially 1:23–28. See more recently Giuseppe Billanovich's *Petrarca letterato* and his numerous articles now published in his *Petrarca e il primo umanesimo*, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 25 (Padua, 1996).

4

The central position of the study of history in Petrarch's work stems from his unceasing preoccupation with time. Perhaps, robbed of spatial constants by an early life of repeated displacement, he sought to establish his identity in the temporal dimension. His insistence in the autobiographical *Ad posterum* on fixing the exact hour of his birth, "in the year 1304 of this latter age which begins with Christ's birth, July the twentieth, on a Monday at dawn," reveals in its exaggerated specificity an anxiety to claim a place in the flow of history.[103]

Yet Petrarch found it impossible to reconcile himself with the particular temporal location anchoring his personality. He felt trapped in an age he despised for its corrupted morals and insignificant actions and looked longingly back to the heroic deeds of the ancient past for consolation. If we are to believe him, it was his sense of alienation from his contemporaries that led to his becoming a historian:

> Among the many subjects, I was especially interested in antiquity, inasmuch as I have always disliked my own age, so that, had not love of dear ones restrained me, I would always have wanted to be born in any other age. In order to forget my own time, I have always tried to place myself in spirit in other times. Therefore, I took pleasure in history.[104]

---

[103] He was probably influenced by Suetonius's *Divus Augustus*, 5: "Natus est Augustus M. Tullio Cicerone C. Antonio cons. VIII. Kal. Octob. paulo ante solis exortum, regione Palati ad Capita Bubula."

[104] *Posteritati*, ed. P.G. Ricci, in Petrarch, *Prose*, 7. Petrarch's pursuit of truth through the study of history may be one response to what Edward Cranz has suggested was a massive epistemological crisis in western Europe involving the substitution over centuries of a conception of the mind as essentially passive by that of the mind as essentially active. Nominalism would be another response. See F. Edward Cranz, "1100 A.D.: Crisis for Us?" in *De litteris: Occasional Papers in the Humanities*, ed. Marijan Despalatovic (New London, Conn., 1978), 84–107. Cranz argues that up to roughly 1100, European thinkers left unchallenged the ancient passive version of human intellection as working with ideas already formed and present to the mind. They were either given to the mind by God or were potentially present in an outside reality, waiting to be thought by a mind. Once the mind is conceived as active, the issue of *adaequatio* arises. Cranz argues that Petrarch's assumption of the mind as creator of ideas lies at the basis of his subjectivism. This line of thought is analyzed in Petrarch's case by Charles Trinkaus in *The Poet as Philosopher: Petrarch and the Formation of Renaissance Consciousness* (New Haven, 1979), 27–51. On the basis of Cranz's position, one could argue that Petrarch's turn to history represents an effort to find truth "internally," i.e., in what human beings have done rather than in an external world whose representation in our minds is uncertain.

History provided a way of escape from the prison house of the present.

"I have always tried to place myself in spirit in other times": the declaration suggests an imaginary self-transport across history, of a kind that no one before Petrarch, so far as I know, ever claimed to have made. Walks through the ruins of Rome, for example, unleashed a flood of images connecting ancient historical events with specific Roman sites. In recalling the experience in a letter to his companion on these walks, Cardinal Giovanni Colonna, Petrarch presented their progress through the city as a procession of the imagination through Roman history from the origins of the city down to the triumph of Christianity.[105] To abstract the self and project it thus into another time was to experiment with a new construction of subjectivity, analogous, perhaps, to those that artists would later bring to bear when they considered objects in perspective from vantage points that they had not actually experienced.[106]

For Petrarch, the escape to the past was an escape from mediocrity. That mediocrity had been exacerbated by generations of carelessness about preserving the literary and cultural legacy of the ancient pagan world:

> I do not find any complaint of this sort in the ancients, doubtless because nothing of the like ever happened. But if events go on as I foresee, our grandchildren will have no knowledge or sense of this loss. The

[105] *Rerum fam.* VI.2, in *Familiari* 2:55–58. For example, he writes: "Vagabamur pariter in illa urbe tam magna, que cum propter spatium vacua videatur, populum habet immensum; nec in urbe tantum sed circa urbem vagabamur, aderatque per singulos passus quod linguam atque animum excitaret: hic Evandri regia, hic Carmentis edes, hic Caci spelunca, hic lupa nutrix et ruminalis ficus, veriori cognomine romularis, hic Remi transitus, hic ludi circenses et Sabinarum raptus" (56). Green, *Light in Troy*, 88–92, analyzes this letter in detail and concludes that Petrarch's "inquisitions of landscape reveal him in the act of discovering history, and they reveal how creative, how inventive was this act for which he is properly famous" (90). In discussing the same letter, Kenneth Gouwens, "Perceiving the Past: Renaissance Humanism after the 'Cognitive Turn,'" *American Historical Review*, 103 (1998), 68, stresses the relationship between Petrarch's reading and Petrarch's "tactile/visual experience" with the past. "Thus the literary representation and tangible remnants of the past," he writes, "commingled in Petrarch's affective experience of antiquity, the combination of verbal cues with visual and tactile ones facilitating its being embedded in his memory."

[106] Illustrative of the new subjectivity in art is Bonsignori's aerial view of Florence of the late sixteenth century. See Richard Goldthwaite, "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture," *American Historical Review* 77 (1972): 979. The drawing represents the city as seen from above at a distance of several thousand feet.

> ones knowing all, the others ignoring all, no one will have a cause to grieve. But I, with so many reasons to lament, have none to console me, placed as I am at the boundary line between two people and looking, at the same time, behind and ahead.[107]

Caught between two worlds with a Janus-like awareness, Petrarch realized with anguish (and self-congratulation) the responsibility that he must assume to save what remained of the fragmented ancient heritage and to educate the next generation to appreciate its relevance for their own lives.

To Petrarch's mind, antiquity served the moral regeneration of present-day society not only in word but also in deed. Just as the wisdom and eloquence of ancient paganism aroused in men the desire to reshape their lives, accounts of the deeds of ancient heroes stood ready to provide models of conduct, especially for political and military leaders. As he wrote in both prefaces (1351/53 and 1371/74) to his unfinished *De viris illustribus*, defining the object of the historical work:

> Unless I am mistaken, this is the profitable goal for the historian: to point up to the readers those things that are to be followed and those to be avoided, with plenty of distinguished examples provided on either side.[108]

While he sought to establish the truth of events and relate them in a dignified style, the didactic purpose of his historical writing was uppermost.

Intimately connected with his emphasis on the value of studying the lives of ancient pagans was his desacralization of ancient time, which, by allowing the Romans to be approached as human beings, made them accessible for imitation. We have already seen Petrarch's rejection of the Christian apologetic identification of certain statements by ancient poets as products of divine inspiration. To his mind, as we have seen, although the poets' talents were God-given,

---

[107] *Rerum memorandarum libri*, I.19:19. Petrarch sometimes expresses in this image of himself as mediator a certain optimism about posterity. See also T.E. Mommsen, "Petrarch's Conception of the 'Dark Ages,'" *Speculum* 17 (1942): 226–42, rpt. in *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Eugene Rice, Jr. (Ithaca, N.Y., 1959), 106–30. For bibliography on the consciousness of the Renaissance among humanists themselves, see Rizzo, "Il latino del Petrarca," 349, n. 1.

[108] Benjamin Kohl, "Petrarch's Prefaces to the *De viris illustribus*," *History and Theory* 14 (1974): 141 and 143.

their words were shaped by their natural powers and could not articulate transcendental truths beyond their natural powers.

The denial of any special divine communication to the ancient poets had enormous consequences for Petrarch's approach to antiquity. It meant that the ancient pagans could be treated as men, supremely gifted in some cases, but still men like Petrarch and his generation, and therefore susceptible to judgments based on reason and practical experience. This attitude implied a vision of the past as a succession of moments, each one qualitatively similar to those in the present day. A hundred and fifty years before Machiavelli, Petrarch emphasized the basic constancy of human nature. In speaking at one point of the moral aphorisms found in Plautus, he remarked that whereas cities fell with the passage of time, kingdoms were transferred, customs varied, and laws were altered,

> those things which are truly innate by nature do not change, and the minds of men and the diseases of minds are really the same as they were when Plautus imagined them.[109]

Having enhanced the accessibility of the past by introducing the notion of the uniformity of time, Petrarch placed his peculiar, individualistic stamp on the results. His *Letters to Famous Men*, contained in *Rerum familiarium* XXIV, constitutes clear evidence of the freedom Petrarch felt to approach the great writers of Greek and Roman antiquity directly as men of flesh and blood. In those letters, addressed personally to ancient masters of prose and poetry, the fourteenth-century writer spoke to the ancients as equals and as historically conditioned beings like himself. Discoursing freely on the quality of their work and the character of their lives, he showed no reluctance about criticizing their conduct.

Petrarch's first letter to Cicero manifested both the strengths and weaknesses of the humanist's vision of the past. Inspired by his rediscovery of Cicero's *Ad Atticum, Brutum, et Quintum fratrem* in the cathedral library of Verona in 1345, the letter presents the ancient

[109] Franco Simone, "Il Petrarca e la sua concezione ciclica della storia," *Arte e storia: Studi in onore di Leonello Vincenti* (Turin, 1965), 405. In his important article summarizing Petrarch's political attitudes, M. Feo, "Politicità del Petrarca," *Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell'umanesimo: Atti del convegno internazionale, Firenze, 19–22 maggio, 1991*, *Quaderni petrarcheschi* 9–10 (1992–93): 116–18, without citing this quotation, illustrates Petrarch's idea of the unchanging nature of human beings over time by citing examples from the humanist's actions.

Roman as an active politician, entangled in the murky politics of life in the senescent Republic. With the emergence of the biographical material came the realization that Cicero's ideas were not abstract, disembodied entities but products of a historically situated individual. So different in fact did Cicero's teachings seem from the conduct of his life as revealed by his correspondence that Petrarch felt called upon to upbraid him for inconsistency and hypocrisy. Unlike Latini, who, while ignorant of many of the historical details, appreciated the political context in which Cicero had moved, Petrarch judged the ancient Roman wanting, not only by his own standards of Christian and scholarly detachment from politics, but also from the standards set by Cicero himself.

While Petrarch might have dated his own letter using the Roman chronology from the foundation of the city as Cicero would have it, he preferred to use a Christian dating to point up a key factor in Cicero's experience, his ignorance of Christian truth. Petrarch wrote in his conclusion:

> From the land of the living, on the right bank of the Adige, in the city of Verona in transpadane Italy, on 16 June in the year 1345 from the birth of that Lord whom you never knew.[110]

Choosing to emphasize the theological divide that separated Cicero from himself, he assigned him to a vague historical location sometime prior to Christ's birth.

This "personal time" in which Petrarch encountered Cicero as present, and yet absent because belonging to an alien, pre-Christian epoch, seems strangely unrelated to Petrarch's conception of "public time," the succession of years linking ancient pagan Rome to Petrarch's age.[111] Indeed, while Petrarch divided public as he did personal time into two periods, the principle of division was different. The first period of public time for the mature Petrarch, the glorious age of antiquity marked by secular achievement, extended only into the early years of the Christian era, when barbarians seized the imperial office and decline began.

The words of "Augustinus" in the *Secretum* (1347–53) suggest that

[110] *Rerum fam.* XXIV.3, in *Familiari* 4:227 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 3:318 (English).

[111] I have taken this terminology of "personal" and "public" time from Donald Wilcox, *The Measure of Times Past: Pre-Newtonian Chronologies and the Rhetoric of Relative Time* (Chicago, 1987), 157 and 166–67.

in the period of its composition Petrarch considered Roman heroes from Romulus to Titus as worthy of being included in his *De viris illustribus*. *Africa*, bk. II, suggests a similar periodization, since Scipio breaks off his prophecy regarding the future of Rome with the reigns of Vespasian and Titus in the late first century, crying out:

> I cannot bear to proceed; for strangers of Spanish and African extraction will steal the scepter and the glory of the empire founded by us with great effort. Who can endure the thought of the seizure of supreme control by these dregs of the people, these contemptible remnants, passed over by our sword?[112]

The last version of the work, however, that dedicated to Francesco Carrara between 1371 and 1374, brings the *Vita* down to Trajan early in the next century.

Whether the reign of Titus or that of Trajan marked the end of the first period of public time, the second followed and lasted down to Petrarch's day. The deeds of princes in the latter age, however, "contribute material not for history but for satire" and he had no need to record them.[113] He reaffirmed this opinion in a letter to Agapito Colonna, who had expressed anger at not receiving mention in Petrarch's history. Cleverly dodging, Petrarch replied that he refused to include any moderns in his work because

> I am unwilling to carry my treatment to such a distance and through so many shadows (*tenebrae*) for so few famous men; for this reason sparing material and labor, I set and determined the limit of my history long before our century.[114]

Consequently, part of the meaning of his rhetorical question "What else, then, is all history if not the praise of Rome?" lay in his belief that, apart from the history of the Romans – conceived of as ending in the late first or early second century C.E. – real history could not be written.

---

[112] *Africa*, bk. II, lines 274–78, in *Africa*, ed. Nicola Festa, Edizione nationale di Petrarca, no. 1 (Florence, 1926), 40:

> Ulterius transire piget, nam sceptra decusque
> Imperii tanto nobis fundata labore
> Externi rapient Hispane stirpis et Afre
> Quis ferat has hominum sordes nostrique pudendas
> Relliquias gladii fastigia prendere rerum?

[113] Kohl, "Petrarch's Prefaces," 138.

[114] *Rerum fam.* XX.8, in *Familiari* 4:29 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters* 2:216 (English).

The single-minded secularism of Petrarch's conception of public time, one implicitly damning the intervening twelve hundred years (including most of the Christian centuries) to oblivion, created an enormous and persistent contradiction running the length of Petrarch's life. Whereas (not without a tinge of conscience) he relished the writings of ancient pagan authors, writings dynamically linked in his mind to their historical personalities in a pre-Christian world, his assessment of the centrality of Roman history in public time would seem to have robbed him of any way to interpret Jerome or his beloved Augustine as anything beyond participants in a world in decline. The fact that the Latin Church Fathers appeared in his writings in a vague spatiotemporal context, in a private time without continuity with its past, probably reflected Petrarch's unconscious ambivalence toward drawing such a conclusion.

To be sure, Petrarch always had the means at hand to belittle the pagans. The ascetic theme that "nothing endures," ubiquitous in his prose and poetry, served as a counterpoint to his enthusiasm for ancient culture. In the face of the eternal, all worldly achievement became worthless, and the secular glory pursued by ancient Roman heroes would seem to have counted least of all. Accentuating that theme, however, brought into question the urgency of his humanist program and robbed his nostalgia for the past of its justification.

The novelty of Petrarch's emphasis on ancient Rome as the sole subject for historical writing becomes clear in light of the three historiographical approaches he inherited: the recent humanist writing of communal history, the medieval universalistic tradition, and the closely related variant of the latter, the *De viris illustribus* literature. In both prose and poetry, recent or contemporary history in which the communes played a role constituted the center of the historical endeavor for Petrarch's humanist predecessors. Antiquity provided various subtexts for Mussato, Ferreto, and Giovanni da Cermenate in their efforts to enhance the importance of the current events they treated, but they betrayed no hint of Petrarchan nostalgia for a lost ancient world. Focusing on modern history, all three evidently considered recent events to be of the greatest didactic relevance for their own time. In contrast, other northern Italian scholars, Riccobaldo in Lovato's generation and Mansionarius and Benzo da Alessandria in Mussato's, represented the tradition of universal history, consolidated in the thirteenth century by Martin of Troppau and Vincent of

Beauvais.[115] In Petrarch's Avignonese circle of friends, the two Colonnesi, Landolfo and his nephew Giovanni, followed the same approach, in their *Brevarium historiarum* and *Mare historiarum* respectively.[116]

Northern European writers in this tradition, like Martin and Vincent, conceived of the world and its various regions as forming a unity and of regional histories as contributing to a continuous sequence of events. Ancient Roman history occupied a significant place in all their narratives, but only as part of an ongoing process guided by the divine hand. While the Italian descendants of the two thirteenth-century northern European historians probably subscribed to similar theological presuppositions for writing universal history, such concerns are not obvious from the manner in which they oriented their work.[117] The Italian universalists seem totally absorbed by the succession of events themselves, unmindful of any overarching significance.[118] Because of their approach to scholarship, these writers were characterized in chapter 4 as antiquarians. Of the five Italian historians – Riccobaldo, Mansionarius, Benzo, and the two Colonnas, Giovanni and Landolfo – all but Landolfo manifest, like Vincent, a strong interest in accuracy in approaching universal history, primarily that part dealing with Roman history.[119] Unlike the communal

[115] Despite the fragmentary nature of its treatment of history, Benzo d'Alessandria's *Chronicon* should probably be counted among the works of this genre.

[116] For fragments of Landolfo's *Brevarium historiarum*, see Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio*, 1.1:129, n. 1. The contents of Giovanni's work are described by Stephen L. Forte, "John Colonna O.P., Life and Writings (ca. 1298–1340)," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 20 (1950): 394–402.

[117] Nor is this purpose evident in the work of Martin of Poland himself, who writes that his work "theologis ac iurisperitis expedit": *Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, ed. L. Weiland, *MGH*, *Scriptores*, vol. 22 (Hannover, 1872), 397.

[118] For instance, the preface of Landolfo's *Brevarium historiarum*, published in Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio*, 1.1:158–59, justifies the work dedicated to John XXII as having summarized the history of the world for His Holiness "ut nec ex multiloquii tedio que narrantur reddantur insipida, nec ex nimie brevitatis compendio que docentur efficiantur obscura."

[119] Claudio Scarpati, "Vincenzo di Beauvais e la letteratura italiana del Trecento," *IMU* 19 (1976): 108, n. 2, identifies Vincent's awareness of the corruption of the texts he deals with and the ubiquity of false attributions. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1984), 219–21, discusses the interest in biblical variants of Parisian theologians in the late twelfth century, especially Stephen Langton. The thirteenth-century Dominicans subjected the Vulgate to a series of revisions: C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge* (Paris, 1944), 144–72. Riccobaldo's use of the Paduan Livy in his writings is discussed by G.

historians, however, none of these writers matches a concern for textual accuracy with a desire to imitate the style of his ancient Roman sources.

Closely linked to the medieval universalistic approach, the *De viris* tradition in the generation before Petrarch was represented by Giovanni Colonna in his second major historical work and by Giuglielmo Pastrengo of Verona.[120] Written specifically "ad corrigendos mores corrigendamque vitam" (for correcting morals and correcting life), Colonna's work, completed at Avignon before his departure for Rome in 1338, differed from the previous tradition of historical biography. Instead of dealing in separate works with pagans and Christians, he favored a chronological arrangement grouped under the letters of the alphabet.[121] The stylistically undistinguished work, devoted to thinkers and writers throughout world history, at least showed a concern to establish a complete bibliography for each an-

Zanella, "Riccobaldo e Livio," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 6 (1989): 53–69. Giovanni Colonna's dependence on Livy is emphasized by Braxton Ross, "The Tradition of Livy in *Mare historiarum* of Fra Giovanni Colonna," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 6 (1989): 70–86. Landolfo appears much less judicious than the other four: Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio*, 1.1:155, describes him as "più fornito di libri che di critica e di stile."

[120] Landolfo might be included here because, after dealing with Christ and Augustus, he "constringe la cronaca universale dentro le due serie parallele delle biografie dei papi e degli imperatori": Giuseppe Billanovich, "Gli umanisti e le cronache medioevali: Il *Liber pontificalis*, le *Decadi* di Tito Livio e il primo umanesimo a Roma," *IMU* 1 (1958): 120. Cf. Giuseppe Billanovich's *La tradizione del testo di Livio*, 1.1:155. Both Vincent and Martin furnish Landolfo with a precedent for structuring a historical account in terms of reigns of emperors and popes. Suggestive for the *De viris* tradition, Martin narrates history from Augustus on, discussing first the emperors (*MGH*, *Scriptores*, 22:408–43) and then the popes (ibid., 443–74). Forte, "John Colonna O.P.," and W. Braxton Ross, "Giovanni Colonna, Historian at Avignon," *Speculum* 45 (1970): 533–63, provide a basic discussion of Giovanni's life and work. See also Ross, "New Autographs of fra Giovanni Colonna," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 2 (1985): 211–30, which announces the discovery of autographs of both the *Mare historiarum* and *De viris illustribus*. Pastrengo's *De viris illustribus et de originibus* is edited by G. Bottari, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 21 (Padua, 1991), with a long introduction. Cf. also, for Pastrengo's life and works, the brief account of Rino Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," *SCV* 2:126–29.

[121] G.M. Gianola, "La raccolta di biografie come problema storiografico nel *De viris* di Giovanni Colonna," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio muratoriano* 89 (1991): 536. Gianola argues convincingly (509–20) that the second version of the text (M), which organizes biography according to religious divisions, is the handiwork of a later editor. Because Colonna's edition (F, B and V) does not always observe chronological order, Ross ("New Autographs," 224–25) maintains that, initially unclear as to his arrangement of biographies, Colonna resorted increasingly to chronological order as the work proceeded.

cient author's work on the basis of a wide-ranging investigation of the possible sources. Significantly, Colonna did not manifest a similar concern for medieval writers.[122]

Pastrengo, another friend and correspondent of Petrarch's, may have had access to Colonna's *De viris* when visiting Avignon in 1339.[123] Pastrengo's contribution to the genre consisted of two separate but related works, *De viris illustribus* and *De originibus*, the first providing biographies of famous writers both pagan and Christian and the second combining condensed biographies of famous men with definitions and etymologies of geographical sites, peoples, stones, etc. with no apparent criteria of selection. Rather than providing a moral goal as justification for his compilation of biographies in his *De viris illustribus*, as Giovanni Colonna did, Pastrengo stressed that, given the ongoing destruction of ancient authors,

> I thought it a worthy purpose to put in writing the names of these famous works and those of their authors, that if by chance these volumes were taken away, the memory of the writers and of the works would, nevertheless, not be forgotten.[124]

A similar purpose was probably in his mind for the *De originibus*. Despite the breadth of learning that Pastrengo displayed in both compilations, honestly acknowledging his heavy borrowing from contemporaries (we recognize among these Mansionarius and Benzo), the work remains in its uncritical approach to its sources – unlike the writings of the humanist communal historians and most of the universalistic historians – and in its encyclopedic character closer to medieval than to humanist scholarship.[125]

---

[122] Ross, "Giovanni Colonna," 540.

[123] Gianola, "La raccolta di biografie," 535–36. Bottari in Pastrengo, *De viris illustribus*, xxxi–xxxii and xciii, acknowledges Colonna's influence on the alphabetical order followed by Pastrengo and on Pastrengo's decision to deal with both pagan and Christian authors. Bottari also points to the possible influence of Alberico da Rosciate's *Dictionarium iuris*, which is alphabetically arranged, and which Pastrengo, as a jurist trained in Bologna, would probably have known (xxxi). For Pastrengo's surviving correspondence with Petrarch, see G. Frasso, "Tre lettere di Guglielmo da Pastrengo a Francesco Petrarca," in *Petrarca, Verona e l'Europa: Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Verona, 19–23 sett. 1991)*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich and Giuseppe Frasso, Studi sul Petrarca, no. 26 (Padua, 1997), 89–115.

[124] Pastrengo, *De viris illustribus*, 3–4: "Dignum putavi illustrium illorum et scriptorum suorum nomina scriptis tradere, ne si quo forte casu absumerantur volumina, conditorum tamen et operum non obliteraretur memoria."

[125] Bottari discusses the great variety of sources on which Pastrengo drew (ibid., lxi–xciv). Pastrengo recognizes his debt to others for works that he did not himself

Petrarch's indecision about the scope of his *De viris illustribus* points to his own groping toward a new appraisal of the past. In 1351–53 he altered what we have seen as his longstanding plan to write a history of famous Romans from Romulus to Titus by extending his scope to include biblical and mythological figures.[126] Abandoning the project with only twelve lives completed from Adam to Hercules, he returned two decades later to the original all-Roman project, finishing a series of lives from Romulus to Trajan. Apparently he decided in the end to deal not with figures of mythology and of men who were great because divinely inspired, but with men who were great in their own right.[127] As it turned out, Petrarch combined in his *De viris illustribus* the stylistic preoccupations of the communal historians with the philological concerns of the best members of the other two groups – that is, those of the universalistic and famous-men traditions – while adding a Roman emphasis of his own.

Dismissing all that had transpired since the early second century C.E. as unworthy of a historian's attention, Petrarch isolated ancient Roman history alone as the object of scholarly investigation. By integrating his humanist predecessors' concern for relevance with a passionate interest in the ancient Roman past, Petrarch intensified the dialogue between antiquity and the present and advanced significantly the process of defining both cultures. Indeed, Petrarch's reorientation of humanist historical interests toward exploration of the ancient past to a large extent defined the focus of humanist

---

read: "Ipsius itaque fretus iuvamine, scripta que legi et eorum auctores ediseram; que autem non legi aut vidi, sed ab illustribus et doctissimis viris tradita accepti, adiciam" (ibid., 3).

[126] Kohl, "Petrarch's Prefaces," 133, compares three different plans that Petrarch developed for the work over the years. Manuscript evidence suggests that Petrarch never succeeded in joining his biographies of religious and legendary figures to his Roman biographies. The second version of Petrarch's *De viris illustribus*, containing twelve lives of biblical and legendary heroes, is found in two manuscripts, BNP, *Vat. Lat.* 6069.I, and BAV, *Lat.* 1986: E. Pellegrin, *Manuscrits de Pétrarque dans les bibliothèques de France* (Padua, 1966), 376–77; and her *Manuscrits de Pétrarque à la Bibliothèque vaticane: Supplément au catalogue de Vattasso* (Padua, 1976), 125–26. The absence of a preface for this series of lives may indicate Petrarch's ambivalence about integrating biblical figures with pagan heroes. I am grateful to Lilian Armstrong of Wellesley College for her advice on the matter of this second version of the *De viris*.

[127] Unlike Giovanni Colonna and Pastrengo, who celebrated as writers the great military and political leaders who were known as authors, Petrarch, treating them as moral examples, stressed their public roles instead. It appears an incongruous focus for one so reluctant to participate in public life himself.

historical writing in the next generation. Only after 1400 would the earlier concern for modern local history resume, now endowed with greater historical perspective, as the first example of the new history, Bruni's *Historiae florentini populi*, would show.

Rome not only provided the focus of Petrarch's historical investigations, it played the same role in his conception of contemporary politics. Because the humanists of the first two generations had worked, thought, and written within the context of the Italian commune, their historical sense had been bounded by the region in which their city-states functioned. While acknowledging modern Rome as the capital of Christendom, they had expressed no particular reverence for the city's secular tradition. If they harbored a vague loyalty to a general Italian heritage, their political allegiance belonged to their own city-state, which they served with their talents.

In contrast, having come of age in the monarchical environment of Avignon, where the joint rule of the world by the emperor and the pope was more credible, Petrarch was led to emphasize the continuing centrality of Rome in the mediocre political universe of his day. Since Rome for Petrarch remained the legitimate seat of both the universal spiritual and temporal powers, the pope's residence at Avignon and the emperor's in Prague testified to the corruption of the times and to the need for moral reform.

He even entertained hope that their return to their true capital could generate first a political and then a general renewal. As he wrote in *Sine nomine*, 4, in 1352:

> If things were only otherwise, human affairs would be in better shape and the world would be more virtuous, its leadership still unimpaired .... When was there ever such peace, such tranquillity and such justice; when was virtue so honoured, the good so rewarded and the evil punished; when was there ever such wise direction of affairs than when the world had only one head and that head was Rome? Better still, at what time did God, the lover of peace and justice, choose to be born of the Virgin and visit the earth?[128]

For decades, Petrarch cried out against the popes' desertion of the See of Peter, the dire consequences of that desertion for the spiritual life of believers, and the moral and physical deterioration of the city of Rome itself.

---

[128] *Sine titulo liber* is found in Paul Piur, ed., *'Buch ohne Namen' und die päpstliche Kurie* (Halle an der Saale, 1925). The passage quoted is found on 175. The translation is found in *Petrarch's Book Without a Name*, trans. N.P. Zacour (Toronto, 1973), 47.

As for contemporary Rome's temporal role in world politics, without any practical political experience or clear idea of what ancient republicanism had been, Petrarch committed himself in the 1340s to supporting the muddled efforts of Cola di Rienzo to restore the *Respublica romana* to its former position.[129] Although he came to realize Cola's ineptitude by the autumn, in the months immediately following Cola's revolt in Rome in June 1347, Petrarch passionately supported the Roman tribune, at the cost of alienating his Colonna patrons. As late as the letter of 1352 just cited, nevertheless, despite Cola's failure and Petrarch's own belief in the mediocrity of men in his own time, he felt able to write of Cola's Roman revolt: "I believe that hardly anything greater than this has been tried since the beginning of time."[130]

Petrarch's loyalty to Rome easily blended into a general sense of loyalty to Italy. Lacking the limiting communal loyalties of his humanist predecessors, he embraced the whole of Italy, the garden of the Empire, as his motherland. The years in Avignon served to sharpen his Italian patriotism. He interpreted efforts by the French cardinals to make Avignon the permanent seat of the papacy as

[129] An English version of Petrarch's correspondence with Cola, including letters from the *Variae*, *Sine nomine*, and the *Rerum familiarium*, together with the fifth poem of his *Bucolicum carmen* referring to Rienzo, is published by Emilio Cosenza, *Petrarch: The Revolution of Cola di Rienzo* (Chicago, 1913; rpt. New York, 1986). Petrarch does not seem to have thought much about the long-term government of Rome beyond the vague goals of Rienzo, that is, beyond restoring liberty to the city and returning it to a position of glory. There is no question that Petrarch's dearest political goal was to have emperor and pope return to Rome.

Examining Petrarch's life as a whole, we can say that he was more comfortable in cities ruled by lords than in republics. He grew up in the largest court in Christendom and consistently found favor with princes in later years. He was probably speaking his mind when, in a letter to Paganino, adviser to Luchino Visconti, probably written between 1339 and 1346, he stated: "Certe ut nostrarum rerum presens status est, in hac animorum tam implacata discordia, nulla prorsus apud nos dubitatio relinquitur, monarchiam esse optimam relegendis reparandisque viribus italis, quas longus bellorum civilium sparsit furor. Hec ut ego novi, fateorque regiam manum nostris morbis necessariam ...." (*Rerum fam.* III.7, in *Familiari* 1:117). He then endorsed Luchino's conquests in northern Italy, but cautioned him to rein himself in from then on.

Despite ambivalence toward Julius Caesar throughout his life, his biography of Caesar in the *De viris* is very favorable: see examples in my "The *De tyranno* and Coluccio Salutati's View of Politics and Roman History," *Nuova rivista storica* 53 (1969): 445, n. 44.

[130] *Briefwechsel*, 183; *Petrarch's Book*, 56.

aimed at humiliating Rome for the benefit of French prestige.[131] Opposition at Avignon toward Cola's enterprise appeared to him to be another sign of French attempts to destroy the Italian imperial inheritance. Some of the most eloquent expressions of his love of Rome and Italy are to be found in his correspondence concerning Cola da Rienzo.

At bottom, Petrarch's view of Rome seems to have consisted largely of idealism mingled with nostalgia, offering little scope for practical political action. He began with a dim view of scholars as political activists. Cicero would have been far more consistent in his teachings and more profitable both to himself and to his own and future generations had he not dabbled in politics. As a counselor to princes from the quiet of his study, Petrarch strove to inspire them to rise above mediocrity, without himself, however, having any clear plan for a general regeneration of contemporary political life. Intensely conscious of his own individuality, he placed whatever hopes he had for the renewal of civic life in the moral reform of individual leaders, which could at best have had only fragmented and discontinuous effects. While he appealed beyond his generation to what he hoped would be a more enlightened posterity, he had only the vaguest notion of how to prepare the way for its coming.[132]

5

I have attempted to show in this chapter that Petrarch's influence on humanism was far different from what it is generally recognized to be, largely because he has been treated as the founder of a movement rather than as the leader of its third generation. Disqualifying the contributions of earlier humanists with the labels "prehumanists" or "protohumanists," modern historians of the movement have taken the measure of its development with Petrarch as the initiator. Seen in a longer perspective, however, his contribution to humanism, while important, assumes another shape.

---

[131] *Briefwechsel*, 224-26.

[132] Mommsen, "Petrarch and the 'Dark Ages,'" 127–28, cites the hopeful passage from the *Epist. metr.* III.33, alluding to the possibility of an imminent, happier time. Petrarch echoed this expectation in his repeated appeal to the judgment of posterity.

Initially inspired by the needs of Italian society to find legitimacy for its cultural uniqueness, the first two generations of humanists and their companions, the vernacular translators, sought to locate their society directly in relation to Latin antiquity. Despite certain connections with his Italian predecessors, Petrarch, growing to manhood in southern France at the papal court, developed humanism in a different milieu and endowed it with a Christian conscience destined to play a role in its evolution ever afterward.

Yet while the blend concocted by Petrarch served to attract scholars outside of Italy, it probably slowed the progress of humanism in Italy itself. As I have suggested, the thinness of the line of humanists down to the end of the fourteenth century owes much to the difficulties intrinsic to humanist techniques of reading and writing. But Petrarch's religious bent must bear some of the responsibility for the pace at which humanism gained Italian recruits. His reputation as the "great salesman" of humanism is contradicted by the limited number of disciples in the next generation who seriously pursued study and imitation of the ancients. Granted, they were numerous and talented enough to sustain and slowly expand the movement, in part out of reverence for him. The significant change in the fortunes of humanism occurred, however, in the fifth generation. The almost immediate success of humanist education among the Italian upper classes in the decades after 1400 derived largely from the appeal exercised by the heady secularism of another kind of humanist thought. Not that Petrarchan tendencies disappeared from the movement, but they were not what brought the Italian upper classes into the market for humanist education.

Petrarchan humanism balanced a passionate classicism with a traditional Christian devotion, and the two could often be held together only by verbal subterfuge. The extent to which Boccaccio's attraction to Petrarch's classicism contributed to the conflicted allegiances of his later life is debatable, but of Petrarch's effect on Salutati in the next generation there can be no question. Raised within a confident secular humanism, Salutati, succumbing to Petrarch in early maturity, never again felt at peace with antiquity. The last years of Salutati's life were troubled by outspoken criticism of the Petrarchan legacy by his younger colleagues, who subscribed to a different aesthetic and conceived of its ultimate goals in a very different context.

The philological foundation on which the humanism of Lovato and his followers rested had not been theirs alone. The universal

histories composed both north and south of the Alps, from the *Speculum* on, manifested an intensifying interest in the ancient Roman segment of time, accompanied by a new critical acumen. Walter Burley's *De vita et moribus philosophorum* and Richard de Bury's *Philobiblon* are early-fourteenth-century northern examples of this new attention to ancient history and culture. While Lovato and Mussato rose above the northern European scholars writing about antiquity – and above those in their own milieu, that is, Mansionarius, Riccobaldo, and Benzo – in the range of their acquaintance with ancient texts and perhaps in their powers of textual analysis, what really distinguished them was their desire to write like the ancients and their deflection of attention from antiquity itself to its value for contemporary concerns.

We might assume that Petrarch's initial interest in the city of Rome was inspired not by humanist influence from Italy but rather by the broader, universalistic scholarship current at the papal court. Ultimately his achievement was to weld the humanist aesthetic and demand for relevance to the historical focus of antiquarian scholarship and to make ancient Rome, already prominent in universalistic accounts, the prism through which to view all human culture and history. But the resulting vision was at best episodic and easily displaced by the perspective of eternity. Petrarchan humanism, based on the assumption of the compatibility of Christianity with ancient pagan culture, could only survive by its readiness to shift back and forth between pagan and Christian contexts and by effecting occasional verbal reconciliations that could not sustain close inspection.

CHAPTER SEVEN

COLUCCIO SALUTATI

In Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406), the leader of the fourth generation of Italian humanists, the communal loyalties characteristic of the first two generations merged with the Christian humanism of the cosmopolitan Petrarch. Born in 1331 in Stignano, on the border between Florentine and Lucchese territory, Salutati received all of his formal education in Bologna, where his exiled family lived until 1350/51. Married in 1366, widowed in 1371, and married a second time in 1374, Salutati fathered at least eleven children, nine boys and one girl. As a result of his thirty-one years in the lucrative office of chancellor of the Florentine Republic, from 1375 until his death in 1406, he earned not only international honors but enough money to indulge his passion for book collecting without threatening his family's financial security. Through a vast correspondence with learned men in Italy and France, he turned his study in Florence into a kind of clearinghouse for news about manuscripts, recent humanist writings, and employment opportunities for job-seeking scholars throughout Italy and northern Europe. By the time of his death, the vital center of the humanist movement, itinerant in the previous generation depending on Petrarch's places of residence, became anchored in the Tuscan city.

1

Although Salutati provides little information about his school years, he did claim Pietro da Moglio (d. 1383), one of the leading pedagogues of the day, as his teacher. Probably a student of Giovanni del Virgilio, da Moglio tried to keep abreast of humanistic currents. At least late in life, he maintained a correspondence with Petrarch.[1]

[1] Salutati describes Pietro da Moglio as "meus in adolescentia ... premonitor": Salutati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, ed. Francesco Novati, 4 vols., in FSI, vols. 15–18 (Rome, 1891–1911), 1:115. On da Moglio, see Giuseppe Billanovich, "Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro da Moglio, Francesco da Fiano," *IMU* 6 (1963): 203–34 and *IMU* 7 (1964): 279–324; and Giuseppe Billanovich and C.M. Monti, "Una nuova fonte

Da Moglio's two ten-line poems, each containing one-line summaries of the ten Senecan tragedies and doubtless used for mnemonic purposes in the classroom, reveal his allegiance to the fundamental author of early humanism.[2] Da Moglio's commentaries on the poetic exchange between Giovanni del Virgilio and Dante and on Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* indicate that he was not reluctant to use moderns for teaching purposes along with ancients.[3] Of his other poetry only a 249-line lament of Dido's sister, Anna, survives.[4] While poetry provided him with most of the material that he used in his classroom, he also used the *De quattuor virtutibus*, Valerius Maximus, and Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*.[5]

We cannot be sure whether da Moglio taught these texts in a grammar school or in a university, either at Padua after 1362 or at Bologna after 1368. While like Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro doubtless taught grammar school in the years before taking up the Paduan appointment, his epithet, "Pietro della retorica," suggests that he was best known as a teacher of rhetoric.

There are two indications that Salutati studied only rhetoric with da Moglio. The first concerns Salutati's description of the teacher as "my guide in adolesence," that is, when Salutati was at least fourteen, which was roughly the age when boys were finishing grammar school.[6] The second lies in the fact that Salutati's only reference to da

---

per la storia della scuola de grammatica e retorica nell'Italia del Trecento," *IMU* 17 (1979): 367–412. Chapter 7 is largely a summary of my two books on Salutati: *Salutati and His Letters* (1976) and *Hercules* (1983). I have kept footnotes to a minimum here and referred the reader to those monographs for detailed references. My former position on Salutati's training with da Moglio, found in Witt, *Hercules*, 15–19, has been substantially revised.

[2] Giuseppe Billanovich, "Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 7 (1964): 293–98.

[3] Ibid., *IMU* 6 (1963): 205–34.

[4] Ibid., *IMU* 7 (1964): 301–307.

[5] Ibid., 291.

[6] Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:115: "meus in adolescentia ... premonitor." Salutati used the term advisedly: Witt, *Hercules*, 14, n. 31. On the usual ages for school, see my "What Did Giovannino Read and Write? Literacy in Early Renaissance Florence," *I Tatti Studies* 6 (1995): 84. A student attended elementary school from about six to eleven and grammar school from eleven to fourteen or fifteen. Giovanni Conversini (1343–1408), however, who received his education in Bologna, Ravenna, and Ferrara a decade after Salutati, finished grammar school at twelve (1355). He then studied dialectic (1356–57), and in 1359, after a two-year hiatus, he studied rhetoric for about a year before beginning the two-year course in the notariate: Conversini, *Rationarium vitae*, ed. V. Nason (Florence, 1986), 9–10. Like Conversini, Salutati likely studied dialectic; at least Leonardo Bruni, *Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus*, in *Prosatori*, 48 and 50, has Salutati say that he had been trained intensely in the art of

Moglio's teaching related to instruction in *ars dictaminis*. In a poem accompanying his short letter to his teacher in 1360–61, ten years after leaving Bologna, Salutati praised da Moglio for having taught him the "power of the letter."

From the description, the instruction was based on the standard five-part letter of *dictamen*.[7] Perhaps da Moglio's apparently tacit refusal to correspond with his former student, which Salutati lamented in his letter, was a response to Salutati's having abandoned the *dictamen* formulae of his training. Da Moglio may have been too embarrassed with his own level of diction to respond. In fact, da Moglio's two surviving late letters to Petrarch reflect an earnest but unsuccessful attempt to imitate Petrarch's familiar style. Both justify Guarino's pronouncement on da Moglio's letters: "He speaks so ineptly, obscurely, and strangely that he seems not so much to speak as to bellow."[8]

Whoever Salutati's grammar teacher had been, we cannot be sure that his reading in grammar school, even in the university town of Bologna, went beyond the traditional one in the same period in Florence. Salutati's "discovery" of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* four or five years after he returned with his family to Stignano in 1350/51 suggests that it did not. As Salutati himself explained, his love of literature came on suddenly, directly inspired "as if by divine gift," when he was reading Ovid's work.[9] His description of the experience suggests that this was probably his initial contact with Ovid.

---

disputation. For his own purposes, however, Bruni in his dialogue had his character Salutati define disputation in a novel way (see below, 434, n. 88).

[7] The letter to da Moglio is found in Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:3–5. The poem is edited by Berthold L. Ullman, in his *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Storia e letteratura, 2nd ser., no. 51 (Rome, 1973), 298.

[8] Guarino's remark is found in Remigio Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini veronese* (Catania, 1896), 176: "adeo enim inepte obscure et inusitate dicit, ut non tam loqui quam mugire videatur." Cf. Giuseppe Billanovich, "Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 7 (1964): 322. See the letters, ibid., 283–84 and 287–88.

[9] *De laboribus Herculis*, ed. B.L. Ullman, 2 vols. (Zurich, 1951), 1:215: "Multa quidem sibi (Ovid) debeo, quem habui, cum primum hoc studio in fine mee adolescentie quasi divinitus excandui et accensus sum, veluti ianuam et doctorem. Etenim nullo monitore previo nullumque penitus audiens a memet ipso cunctos poetas legi et, sicut a deo datum est, intellexi, postquam noster Sulmonensis michi venit in manus." Cf. Berthold L. Ullman, *The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati*, Medioevo e umanesimo, no. 4 (Padua, 1963), 44–45.

> I owe many things to him [Ovid], who served as a door and teacher when in the last part of my adolescence I was first as if divinely kindled and inspired for this study. For with no guiding instructor and listening to no teacher at all, I read all the poets by myself and, after our Sulmonian came into my possession, as if given a gift by God, I understood them.[10]

Salutati had already cared enough about ancient authors in 1351/52, to attend a lecture by Zanobi da Strada on Virgil in the Florentine cathedral, before Zanobi's departure for Naples, but on that occasion his principal motivation may have been a wish to see and hear the renowned teacher.[11] In any case, in describing his encounter with Ovid, Salutati insisted that he owed his appreciation of poetry to no one but himself, discounting, of course, divine influence.

That his memory and dating of the experience were approximately correct is borne out by the purchase of four manuscripts in October 1355: Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticales* and works by Virgil, Lucan, and Horace. Years later, moreover, he confided that, around the same time, the study of Priscian's monumental text awakened him – and again he also credited divine influence – to the importance of orthography, initiating his lifelong concern with the reform of spelling.[12]

The early presence in Salutati's library of a manuscript containing the complete *Tragedies* of Seneca, together with Mussato's *Ecerinis* and *Somnium*, links him to the interests and achievements of pre-Petrarchan humanism. BL, *Add.* 11987, the only manuscript in Salutati's library so far identified as having been copied by the humanist himself, would probably have been written in a period when he was too poor to commission a professional amanuensis. The marginal and interlinear annotations testify to Salutati's intense philological and stylistic study of the text over the years.[13]

From his earliest surviving letters of 1359–61, written in Stignano, until late in his stay in Rome at the papal curia in 1369, Salutati's writings, like those of the first two generations of humanists, dealt

[10] In Witt, *Hercules*, 54–55, I was unable to reconcile what I then assumed was Salutati's training in grammar with his claim to having read and understood Ovid and all the poets unaided by a teacher.

[11] On Salutati's summary of Zanobi's lectures of ca. 1351–52, see Ullman, *Humanism of Coluccio Salutati*, 42–43.

[12] Ibid., 108–09 and 167.

[13] Ibid., 197, and Witt, *Hercules*, 55–56.

with a restricted range of themes: the importance of friendship and love of country, the constant threat posed to human happiness by fate and fortune, and in the face of those forces the need for self-control. The same themes had informed the literature of *dictamen* in preceding centuries, although they had been expressed in more aphoristic terms. Like the earlier humanists and, before them, the *dictatores*, Salutati treated the themes within a totally secular context.

His earliest correspondence from 1359/1361 to 1366 identified the essential moral conflict as one between human virtue and "envious," "cruel," "treacherous," and "deceptive" fortune, which, now alluring, now raging, threatened the government of our emotions. Despising in proper Stoic fashion the ignorant mob, always vulnerable to the whims of fortune, Salutati praised the sage, who knew that he had nothing to fear from afflictions of the body. Although even the sage might falter at fortune's first assault, he would quickly resume control of his emotions, realizing that not even death was an evil.[14] Evincing a generically Stoic moral position difficult to trace to any specific source, Salutati, in common with a long Italian rhetorical tradition, made no effort to relate morality to Christian doctrines.

The patriotism of Salutati's letters written before his departure from Stignano in mid-1367, first to Todi and then in 1368 to Rome, accorded badly, however, with an ethic emphasizing detachment from worldly objects. Like Lovato and Mussato, Salutati was passionately attached to his local commune and employed his eloquence in its interests. For sixteen years, while practicing as a private notary or working as chancellor in nearby communes, Salutati participated vigorously in local government. By the mid-1360s, he appears to have become political leader of the commune of Buggiano, made up of the village of Stignano together with three other villages: Buggiano, Colle-a-Buggiano, and Borgo-a-Buggiano.[15] His patriotic utterances, consequently, were rooted to an extent in his practical experience. The individual, he wrote (*Epist.*, 21), had obligations to parents, wife, children, relatives, and friends, but, because the *patria* subsumed all those relationships, to it was owed the deepest respect and commitment to service. Presumably in Salutati's case the *patria* would have been his own rural commune. In 1366, he bombastically exclaimed:

[14] Witt, *Hercules*, 63–65.

[15] For Salutati's political and professional life in the Valdinievole and especially in Buggiano, see ibid., 25–52.

> If it would serve to defend or extend the homeland, we should not consider it a distasteful or hard task to thrust an ax into our father's head, mangle our brothers, and deliver the unborn child from one's wife's womb with a sword.[16]

Although he referred to patriotism as *caritas*, the word for him did not at the time suggest Christian charity (as the quotation above makes clear). He applied *caritas* freely to both Christian and pagan love of country (*caritas patriae*).[17]

Salutati's insistence on civic duty constituted only one element of a general moral outlook emphasizing individual responsibility that he developed in these early letters. Although in the battle for moral freedom the individual ultimately could rely only on his own inner resources, moral resolve could be intensified and nourished externally by eloquence. Because the distinctive human faculty was the power of speech, the individual who best realized the human essence was the eloquent orator, in whom moral virtue and mastery of language met. While effectively setting forth precepts of morality in compelling words, the orator testified to their truth by the conduct of his life. Through him, eloquence served as the vital force in society, stirring men, neglectful of virtue and borne down by bad habits and concern for the body, to seek a better life. For his own guidance, the orator must turn to the ancients:

> For who, I ask, without the writings of the ancients, with nature alone as a guide, will be able to explain with sufficient reason what is honorable, what useful, and what this battle of the useful and honorable means? Doubtless nature makes us fit for virtues and secretly impels us to them, but we are made virtuous not by nature but by works and learning (*Epist.*, 1:106).

By 1369, when these lines were written, Salutati must have been aware that the great Petrarch had similarly made a strong connection between moral improvement and eloquence honed by study of the ancients. But when did Salutati first come in contact with Petrarch's work?[18]

---

[16] Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:28: "Si pro illa tutanda augendave expediret, non videretur molestum nec grave vel facinus paterno capiti securim iniicere, fratres obterere, per uxoris uterum ferro abortum educere ...."

[17] On *caritas* in the Middle Ages and in Salutati's writing in this period, see Witt, *Hercules*, 73–75.

[18] For a general treatment of the role of rhetoric in humanism, consult the classic article of Hanna H. Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence,"

As a boy in Bologna, he would probably have heard of the poet's crowning in Rome in April 1341, but before Petrarch organized collections of his Latin letters and his Latin and vernacular poetry during the plague years, under the threat of imminent death, circulation of Petrarch's writings was limited. By the 1350s, many of Petrarch's friends in Florence had copies of his work, but it is difficult to say when Salutati might have gained access to it. By his own report, after being inspired by Ovid, Salutati worked on the poets for a long time on his own. He did not make the acquaintance of Francesco Nelli, one of the leading member of the Florentine group, until 1359/61.[19]

The inclusion of Salutati's first letter to Nelli in 1359/61 in a *copialettere* assembled in Avignon in 1363/64 by Francesco Bruni, then papal secretary, indicates how favorably the group looked on the young man's style.[20] A comparison of Salutati's letter with others in Bruni's manuscript, by Zanobi, Lapo Castiglionchio, Nelli, and Bruni himself, shows that Salutati surpassed all of them in his ability to classicize. If he had not already gained membership in Petrarch's Florentine circle earlier, the letter to Nelli would have been sufficient to earn his admittance. That Salutati decided to start keeping copies of his letters in 1360 or 1361, the date of the first letter (the one addressed to da Moglio) that he included in his own collection of correspondence, serves as further evidence that at about this time the provincial notary decided to launch his career as a literary scholar.[21]

Behind the stylistic achievements of Salutati's letter of 1359–61 must have lain years of effort to move beyond the traditional models

Journal of the History of Ideas 24 (1963): 497–514; and Jerrold Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism: The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom (Petrarch to Valla)* (Princeton, 1968).

[19] Salutati followed the first letter by a second a month later. The letters are published in Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:619–21 (July 20) and 4:241–45 (August 19). I would assign these two letters, as well as the first two published by Novati (*Epist.*, 1:3–6) to 1360/61: Witt, *Hercules*, 62, n. 21.

[20] Francesco Bruni's *copialettere* forms the first part of BNF, *Magl.*, VIII, 1439. Salutati's letter is found on fols. 4v–5v. Novati did not see the manuscript or he would have mentioned the other humanist letters. I intend to publish the *copialettere* in the near future as part of a description of Florentine humanism in this little-known period of its development.

[21] Salutati's first surviving letter to Boccaccio, the most important member of Petrarch's Florentine friends, dates from 1367, but from the tone of the letter, the two men had already known each other for some time (Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:48–49).

that he had learned in da Moglio's classroom. While a chance to study fragments of Petrarch's prose letters may have come his way in the Valdinievole in the 1350s, it is more likely that his models came from a more local source. In the previous generation, in the 1320s, Geri d'Arezzo had already introduced extensive reforms in letter writing, so that in the 1330s and 1340s, when Petrarch was still formulating his own epistolary style, a large number of Geri's letters were circulating in Tuscany. Salutati might have been recognizing his own debt to Geri when in later life he placed the Arretine alongside Mussato at the beginning of the revival of letters in Italy.[22] Returning to Tuscany, Salutati would have encountered Geri's epistolary collection, which perhaps was already playing a local role in modifying the letter style of Boccaccio's generation.

Whatever of Petrarch's writings Salutati had read before his two-year residence in Rome between 1368 and 1370, the leisure he enjoyed while working in the office of Francesco Bruni, one of four papal secretaries, allowed him the opportunity to study Petrarch's writings carefully for the first time. Bruni, a longtime correspondent of Petrarch's, probably had many of Petrarch's writings, and others would have been available from Bruni's curial colleagues. Salutati had earlier written Petrarch a letter without receiving an answer, but through the good offices of Bruni, in September 1368, he began what he hoped would be a longterm correspondence with the hero of avant-garde scholarship.[23] Between September 1368 and August 1369, Salutati wrote Petrarch five letters, but received a response only to the first.[24] The last of the five letters, which chastised Petrarch for not accepting a papal invitation to come to Rome while enjoying, meanwhile, the hospitality of Visconti tyrants, suggests the younger man's bitter acceptance of the fact that the great man would in any case never write to him again.

The earliest manifestations of a decisive change in Salutati's secular outlook appear in letters beginning in April 1369, when citations first from the Bible and then from the Fathers mingle with the usual

[22] Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:84; 88; and 410.

[23] Hesitant to write directly to Petrarch, Salutati had asked Bruni to send Petrarch his greetings when next Bruni wrote to Petrarch. When Petrarch referred to Salutati as a friend in his response to Bruni's letter, Salutati took it as an invitation to write (ibid., 1:62, n. 1).

[24] Ibid., 1:61–62; 72–76; 80–84; 95–96; and 96–99. *Seniles* XI.4, in *Opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Basel, 1554), 885, dated October 4, 1368, is Petrarch's answer.

citations from ancient pagan writers. In a letter of September 31, 1369, to Ugolino Orsini de' Conti di Manupello, consoling him for the recent death of his father, Salutati described the saints and the Holy Trinity in Heaven, where the count's father, having rendered his soul to Christ, now surely dwelt.[25] Here, for the first time, Salutati asserted a close agreement between Christian truth and the ideas of pagan philosophers and introduced a new formulation of his concept of virtue:

> We live with the indulgence of nature and this is common to us and other animals; to live well, however, is peculiar to a human being, and is the mark of a good and virtuous man. This capacity is not within our power alone but is acquired by us through the cooperating grace of God, the virtues, and a good disposition of mind.[26]

Although no certain explanation can be assigned for the gradual introduction of Christian references in his letters from 1369, Salutati's residence in Rome, despite his criticism of the vice and luxury of curial life, perhaps heightened his religious sensibilities and rendered him more open to the Christian message of Petrarch's texts at the very time when he was seeking to establish friendly contact with their author. Whatever the explanation, from 1369 Salutati unambiguously embraced the Petrarchan emphasis on the importance of humanistic studies for Christians. Paradoxically in Salutati's case, however, Christian elements assumed such a pre-emptive role in the thought of his last years that the link between eloquence and Christian faith, so industriously forged by Petrarch, would be threatened.

2

The office of chancellor of the Florentine Republic was the most prestigious bureaucratic position in the government. As chancellor, Salutati had charge of writing the letters of the *Signoria*, the highest executive college of the republic, to other officials of the government, to officials of subject communes, and to foreign powers. A survey of the republic's official letters (*missive*) from 1308, the date of the earliest surviving register for them, down to 1375, when Salutati assumed the position of chancellor, indicates that chancery Latin style went

[25] See Witt, *Hercules*, 86, for this and other evidence of a new religiosity.
[26] Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:111.

through three stages. Between 1308 and 1340, officials wrote in *stilus humilis*, using simple words, limited *colores*, and a few proverbs and biblical citations. Highly regular *cursus* lent gravity to declarative sentences, with minimal subordination of clauses. Chancery style decidedly changed after 1340, when Bonaventura Monachi assumed the chancellorship. While *stilus humilis* still generally prevailed, ser Bonaventura, himself a vernacular poet, introduced a more elaborate style for *missive* sent to foreign powers. He enriched statements of policy with epigrams and quotations from the Bible and Church fathers and in at least one letter interrupted the declarative flow with interjections and optative subjunctives. In that letter ser Bonaventura was using *stilus rhetoricus*, an aulic style marked by interrogatives, exclamations, interjections, and parallel sentence structure, conveying an impression of deep feeling and concentrated energy. Initially developed in the papal and imperial chanceries in the early decades of the thirteenth century and demanding the utmost rhetorical skill, the style appeared only rarely in Italian correspondence after the middle of the thirteenth century.[27] Among the *missive* of ser Niccolò Monachi, ser Bonaventura's son, who succeeded him in 1348, are two further examples of *stilus rhetoricus*, but for the most part, ser Niccolò favored the *stilus obscurus* as his *stilus altus*. In tightening the syntax, rendering it more complicated, and in frequently employing an exotic vocabulary, he may have been emulating the style of the Angevin court in an effort to enhance Florence's image in international affairs.[28]

Salutati had the good fortune to assume his office at the moment when Florence's relations with the pope had deteriorated to the point where talk of war was surfacing. It was widely believed in Florence that the imminent return of the papacy from Avignon to Rome had been coordinated with an attack of papal armies on Tuscany. On its side, among a host of complaints, the Church felt that Florence, an ally of the papacy's in a war against the Visconti of Milan, had a secret agreement with the enemy to frustrate military operations.[29]

[27] On the history of *stilus rhetoricus* generally and its prior use in the Florentine chancery, see Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 31–37.

[28] For an example of each of the three styles used in the Florentine chancery before Salutati, see ibid., 90–94. These paragraphs on Florentine chancery style are based on my analysis, ibid., 29. On Angevin correspondence, see ibid., 29, n. 28.

[29] The charges and countercharges of betrayal are recorded in Salutati's three earliest *missive*, written to the pope in the late spring and summer of 1375 (ibid., 24, n. 5).

The struggle between the Church and one of its traditional Guelf allies, which began in the fall of 1375, offered Salutati an ideal opening for introducing major changes in the chancery's presentation of the republic's foreign policy. In a war fought mainly on paper, Salutati's *missive* were prized as potent weapons in the Florentine arsenal.[30] A master of *stilus rhetoricus*, Salutati proclaimed in ringing periods the justice of Florence's cause and railed against the tyranny of the Church, eager to stifle the liberty of Florence and its own subject cities.[31] In response to a papal interdict on the city and excommunication of government officials, including Salutati, the chancellor's letters aimed at destabilizing papal control of the Patrimony by inciting revolt among the subjected cities. While the papacy's spiritual arms ultimately prevailed by 1378, forcing Florence into a humiliating treaty, Salutati emerged from the conflict as the most famous chancellor in Italy.

Not all of Salutati's letters were composed in Latin. He tended to observe the practice of his immediate predecessor, ser Niccolò Monachi, in determining whether he should write *missive* in Latin or the vernacular: he used Latin when writing to foreign individuals and states and to large subject communes like Pistoia and Pescia. He wrote to smaller, subject communes in the vernacular. His treatment of Florentine citizens varied. All clerics received Latin letters, as did a few Florentine laymen, like Francesco Bruni, who held major posts in the service of other powers. Although there were exceptions, letters to civil and canon lawyers were as a rule written in Latin. Letters to all

[30] According to the assessment supposedly made by Giangaleazzo Visconti in the period when Florence and Milan were opponents, "one letter of Salutati's was worth a troop of horses." Novati in Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:247–48 and 514, provides various versions of this statement attributed to Giangaleazzo.

[31] The power of Salutati's *missive* bothered the papacy enough to cause the papal secretary to break with contemporary papal reliance on *stilus humilis* in writing the papal response to Salutati's earliest *missive* in the summer of 1375 and to attempt his own version of *stilus rhetoricus*. It was an isolated effort. The strained, heavy rhetoric of the papal letter shows that the emotional intensity demanded by the *stilus rhetoricus* could only be achieved by a consummate artist. The papal letter is partly published in Odorico Rainaldi, *Annalium ecclesiasticorum Caesaris Baronii ... continuatione Odorici Raynaldi*, vol. 26 (Lucca, 1739?), 268–69. For the whole letter, see *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Grégoire XI, 1370–1378, intéressant les pays autres que la France*, ed. Guillaume Mollat, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 3 vols. (Paris, 1963–65), 2:137–39. The secretary was probably Francesco Bruni, who appears to have been charged with papal relations with Tuscany (my *Hercules*, 82).

other citizens were written in the vernacular.[32] Salutati treated his vernacular tasks as routine exercises; his artistic aspirations were invested in his Latin correspondence.

From his earliest Latin *missive*, Salutati demonstrated a genius for exploiting the aural character of the *missive* to the fullest, through the use of *stilus rhetoricus*. In theory, by means of his eloquent *missive*, Salutati was able to deliver an oral defense of Florentine policy within the councils and assemblies of the republic's correspondents. In practice, the different modes of receiving his communications significantly qualified their impact. As I have already noted, the letter in *ars dictaminis* was conceived of as an oral communication, and the clear demarcation between its various parts was largely designed to facilitate listeners' comprehension. At least by the fourteenth century, while local officials usually read vernacular letters silently, Latin letters addressed to foreign powers were likely still read aloud on their reception, before a princely audience or in a communal assembly. In the case of most ecclesiastical recipients, the original Latin was probably read, but communicating a Latin letter to a lay audience posed problems.

We will return in the next chapter to the matter of bilingualism in diplomacy and politics in general when we consider the use of the Latin oration in public life, but the issue arises as well for the *missive*, where, in the case of an audience largely illiterate in Latin, a translation could be made in advance. When in May 1390 Salutati informed the Sienese government that their *missive* had been read in a public meeting before five hundred people, how in fact was it presented?[33] Did a reading of the original precede that of the vernacular version, or was only the vernacular read?

The question brings into focus a larger issue: what really was the heuristic impact of Salutati's magnificent Latin style in the case of recipients who were largely Latin-illiterate, that is, most of the mem-

[32] Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 15.

[33] ASF, Signoria, I Canc. Miss., XXII, fol. 122v: "Lecte fuerunt in nostro conspectu et ubi quingentorum et ultra presens aderat multitudo littere quedam sub nomine populi Senensis ad nos et alie per officiales vestros in eadem serie nostris magnificis dominis et aliis quibusdam nostris magistratibus destinate. Audivimus et illas quas nescimus quis capitaneus Partis Guelfe et Guelfi vestre civitatis nostris capitaneis vere Partis Guelfe specialiter direxerunt. In quibus dici non potest quanto dolore fuerit tota nostra civitas contristata, audientibus cunctis voces illas, miseros gemitus et intestina suspiria vere et evidentissime servitutis."

bership of communal governments and many of the heads of minor princely states? Even if almost all Italian laymen above the lowest social level frequently encountered Latin in their daily lives, nonetheless, the overwhelming majority would not have been able to appreciate orally the rhetorical force of a Latin *missive*. Salutati could not have been ignorant of the fact that the audience who could fully understand his letters was small. Yet the report of a few men that Salutati's style was brilliant must have indirectly added authority to the vernacular rendition of his message.

Even if uncomprehending, however, Salutati's Latin-illiterate audience would probably still have insisted that the vernacular reading be prefaced by that of the Latin original. Committed to Latin as the language of diplomacy not merely from habit but from an unexamined assumption that the language of Rome lent honor and gravity to affairs of state, an Italian audience would have expected and wanted a reading of the Latin, even if its main value to them was ritualistic, a way of emphasizing and augmenting the importance of the moment and legitimating the exercise of state power.

The humanists have been accused of playing an anachronistic game in thinking of themselves as latter-day Romans and of deluding themselves by trying to pattern their thought and conduct after a people long extinct. But in this they were hardly original: the tendency had been inherited from their medieval predecessors. The real innovation lay in the fact that the humanists performed their roles with greater knowledge, skill, consistency, and self-consciousness than had their forebears. That they were acting with precedent helps explain, however, why their act found an approving audience.

The Italians' respect for Latin as the language of diplomacy contrasted with the attitude of the French and English royal chanceries, which frequently used French rather than Latin in their public correspondence with foreign powers.[34] Casting off the weight of tradition, the French and English royal courts, both francophone, were pre-

[34] For examples of the use of French in correspondence with Florence, see Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 15. The French and English chanceries in the fourteenth century normally communicated with one another in French. See the correspondence between England's Edward III and France's Charles V regarding the Treaty of Brétigny: E. Perroy, "Charles V et la Traité de Brétigny," *Le moyen âge* 29 (1928): 264–81. See also English chancery letters sent to Charles VI during the reign of Richard II: E. Perroy, *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Richard II*, The Camden Society, 3rd ser., no. 48 (London, 1933).

pared in diplomacy to replace the ancient language with the vernacular, now legitimized by several centuries of literary and scholarly achievement. French imperialistic attitudes may explain the shift to a degree, but practicality was also a consideration: French was the international language of the unscholarly: Latin appeared to be an impediment to communication when French could be used. By contrast, despite the claims of their own vernacular to excellence, Florentines would have considered use of any other language but Latin in corresponding with a foreign power a studied effort at insult.[35] Given the cultural context in which he wrote, then, Salutati would not have felt the slightest silliness or awkwardness in devoting great effort to composing letters whose style most of his recipients could not appreciate.

When Salutati wrote to the papacy, however, he did not have to worry about his Latin being understood. In the letter to the Florentine ambassadors that accompanied his first *missive* to Avignon on May 19, 1375, Salutati made clear that he wanted the *missive* to be seen and heard by as many people as possible.[36] If the ambassadors could not manage a reading in consistory – persumably the pope would decide on the issue after hearing the letter himself – they should circulate it among the cardinals. Similar instructions went along with the next letter. When the outbreak of open war later in the year rendered further communication with Avignon impossible, Salutati turned his attention first to recruiting as many allies as possible to the Florentine cause and second to convincing foreign princes not to follow the papal invitation to confiscate property of Florentines living in their territories.

Gifted with an extraordinary sense of decorum and an ability to imagine what a recipient's disposition would be at the moment of his

[35] As the Florentine chancery did when the Paduan chancery, breaking with its own custom, wrote Florence a letter in vernacular: "Non oportet quod litteras ordinari faciat vestra fraternitas in vulgari. Non quam enim ex defectu dictatoris et stili contigit quod aliquid posset propter id quod intendistis aliter interpretari" (*Miss.*, XXIV, 43).

A vernacular letter from Padua would have been exceptional in that the Paduan chancery appears to have followed rules similar to Florence's on the use of languages in official letters: Benjamin G. Kohl, *Padua Under the Carrara, 1318–1405* (Baltimore and London, 1997), 295.

It should be said that in a few cases Salutati's predecessor used the vernacular in writing to minor foreign powers (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 15, n. 30). Salutati, however, made no exceptions.

[36] Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 31.

missive's arrival, Salutati necessarily varied his style a good deal. Throughout his chancellorship, he consistently wrote to high ecclesiastics and lay princes in a form of *stilus altus*, while in writing to communes he adjusted the level of style to the significance of the message to be communicated. While the most highly crafted *missive* of the war with the Church tended to be composed in *stilus rhetoricus*, oratorical flourishes became less dominant in *missive* composed during the next major conflict, that with Milan between 1389 and 1392, when Salutati endeavored to persuade his audience instead by constructing lurid psychological analyses of Giangaleazzo Visconti, Florence's antagonist in the war. From 1392 until Salutati's death, despite the potential for eloquence provided by continuing wars with Milan and then, on the death of Giangaleazzo (1402), by the scramble for pieces of Milan's empire, Salutati's *missive* showed less inventiveness and vitality.

The letter to Gregory XI dispatched on May 19, 1375, which I have already mentioned, gave Salutati his first opportunity to demonstrate his verbal artistry, a month after taking office. He opened with an elegant exordium crafted to create a mellifluous sequence of clauses ending in a series of regular *velox* meters. The first sentence read:

> Beatissime pater et benignissime domine: Sanctitatis vestre litteras, quibus excusationes innocentie nostre de solita benignitate vestra paternitas acceptabat, multiplicesque causas annectentes, quarum suggestu fuerat vestra clementia perturbata, humilitate recepimus tam debita quam devota.[37]

The rapid succession of substantives added solemnity to the opening, while key words among them, *sanctitatis*, *excusationes*, *benignitate*, *paternitas*, *clementia*, *humilitate*, were designed to convey Florence's reverent humility toward the Holy Father. The final clause, *humilitate recepimus tam debita quam devota*, formed by a *tardus* (*–táte recépimus*) and a *velox* (*débita quàm devóta*) brought the passage to a close. There was no stylistic innovation: the use of the present active participle, the multitude of nouns, and especially the identification of the addressee with adjectival substantives such as *sanctitas* and *paternitas* all represented

[37] Ibid., 95: "O most blessed father and most kind lord. We have received with due and devout humility the letter of Your Holiness in which your paternity accepts with its usual kindness the excuses of our innocence and adds the multiple causes whose implication has disturbed your clemency."

the heritage of *ars dictaminis*. What distinguished this sentence and the whole letter that followed was the skill with which Salutati manipulated a highly formalized set of traditional codes.

Salutati followed the extensive exordium with a detailed reply to papal complaints that Florence had shown itself ungrateful after the Church had given so many benefits to the city. Salutati sought to lay before the pope a full account of recent demonstrations of Florence's loyalty to the papacy, while seasoning the narration with rhetorical questions for emphasis. After detailing the aid given to Cardinal Albornoz in his effort to reconquer lost papal lands and recalling the presence of many Florentines at the siege of Forlì, he asked:

> When the city of Bologna had been besieged by Lord Bernabò and was suffering dire famine to the point that it was going to have to surrender, did we not bring food and did not our food supplies keep the city, snatched from the jaws of the enemy, in the Church's obedience?

A similar question followed:

> Indeed (not to bore Your Beatitude in citing individual cases), who can think of an enemy of the Roman Church in Italy who was not at the same time our enemy?[38]

While Florence as a "popular government" avoided war unless it was attacked, the city had always considered any war in which the Church engaged to be a just war. Again Salutati cited a series of examples. As for those who maintained that the Florentines did not want the pope to return to Italy, why would this be, inasmuch as, given the favors Florence enjoyed from the Church,

> the nearer it is, the more efficiently we will be given wholesome and honest counsel and quickly provided with significant support?[39]

After a long array of arguments anchored in specifics, the *missive* returned in its closing lines to the even, elegant patterns with which it began.

---

[38] Ibid., 96: "Et cum Bononiensis civitas fuisset per dominum Bernabovem obsessa et extrema fama laboraret, adeo quod ad deditionem ventura necessario videretur, nonne eam victualibus iuvimus et ex hostis faucibus evulsam, in devotione Sancte Matris Ecclesie nostra victualia tenuerunt? ... Demum ne referendo singula beatitudini vestre tedium afferamus: Quis unquam in Italia potest hostis Romane Ecclesise recenseri qui noster non fuerit pariter inimicus?" For the events described here, see footnotes, ibid., 98.

[39] Ibid., 97: "Nonne quanto nobis vicinior fuerit, tanto magis efficacior ad salubria ac sincera impendenda consilia et valida cum celeritate subsidia minstranda?"

Contemporaries would have noted the lean, cogent presentation of Salutati's rebuttal against charges of Florentine infidelity. After the elaborate exordium, Salutati proceeded to dismantle his opponents' case step by step. To my knowledge, nothing in surviving *dictamen* literature prior to Salutati rivals the clarity of this detailed brief. The contrast between the tightly argued narrative and its frame, the harmonious exordium and *conclusio*, enhanced the *missive*'s aesthetic effect.

Although Salutati had to rein himself in out of deference to the Holy See in the letter of May 19, 1375, his eloquence exploded in a letter of February 13, 1376, addressed to Ancona, a fellow commune. Exhorting the citizens of the city to revolt against the papal government, he began:

> Amici karissimi: Quid facietis in tanto totius Italie fremitu et in aspiratione tam solide libertatis quam deus sua pietate atque benignitate, miseratus nobilem Italiam exteris gentibus subiacere, cunctis Ausonie populis mirabile facilitate concedit? Stabitisne semper in tenebris servitutis? Non consideratis, o optimi viri, quanta sit dulcedo libertatis? Maiores nostri, omne quidem genus italicum, quingentis annis contra Romanos continuatis proeliis, ne libertatem perderent, pugnaverunt. Nec potuit totius orbis princeps populus Italiam armis subigere donec in societatem imperii pene omnes Italos receperunt, iungentes eos sibi federibus libertate atque civitate donantes. Illi tanta constantia contra eiusdem gentis populum pro libertate steterunt. Vos autem contra Gallos atque Vascones, barbarissimum totius Occidentis genus, pro libertate vestra non insurgetis?[40]

Here Salutati softened the abruptness of the opening interrogative by lengthening the sentence. With two short interrogatives, he restored the intensity, and in three tightly crafted declarative sentences, he suggested by implication how this people's ancestors might have re-

[40] Ibid., 99, with minor emendations: "O dearest friends: What will you do amidst the great murmuring of all Italy and such longing for the unthreatened liberty that God in his affection and kindness, feeling pity that noble Italy lies subjected to foreign peoples, grants to all the people of Ausonia with miraculous willingness? Will you always stand in the darkness of slavery? Do you not consider, O best of men, how sweet liberty is? Our ancestors, indeed the whole Italian race, fought for five hundred years in endless battles against the Romans so that liberty would not be lost. Nor could this leading people of the whole world subdue Italy with arms until they received almost all Italians into a confederacy, joining them in freedom to themselves by pacts and giving them citizenship. These men stood with great steadfastness in defense of liberty against people of the same nation. Will you now not rise in defense of your liberty against Gauls and Gascons, the most barbarous people of the West?"

sponded to the challenge. In light of the historical precedent, the only honorable answer that contemporary citizens of Ancona could make to the final question was affirmative.

As in the letter to Gregory XI, paratactic construction, lexical simplicity, and concentrated statement rendered the message eminently clear. At the outset, the portentous sequence *tanto totius* set the stage for the struggle between *nobilem Italiam*, i.e., *cuncti Ausonie populi* (*Ausonia* being an ancient name for Italy), and *externa gens*. To the *tenebrae servitutis* of the present Salutati opposed the *dulcedo libertatis* of the future. Using parallel structure: *iungentes ... libertate* and *civitate donantes*, he emphasized the equality of the ancient confederacy in its union with Rome. He employed the same technique in contrasting contemporary citizens of Ancona with their ancestors: *illi ... pro libertate steterunt/ Vos ... pro libertate vestra non insurgetis*?

Only a *dictator* with supreme confidence in his power to captivate an audience for an extended time would have risked employing *missive* to lay out detailed, complicated defenses of Florentine foreign policy. Such long narratives were highly unusual in *dictamen*: traditionally the manuals stressed that the narrative should be brief. Salutati could exercise no direct control over the effectiveness of the voice that would actually read his words aloud, but he shaped his words so as to stir the reader to a forceful reading.

Only once in his writing did Salutati reveal his recipe for composing *missive* of this character. A friend in Bologna, dissatisfied with the Bolognese chancellor's official letter denouncing the recent treachery of the count of Montefeltro against that city, wrote Salutati requesting that he compose a more effective letter on the city's behalf. Unwilling to do so, out of regard for his friend Giuliano Zonarini, the Bolognese chancellor, Salutati, obviously flattered, could not resist providing a description of how he would proceed were he to undertake the task. For a start, he would read all the relevant documents, including Zonarini's *missive* and the reply of Montefeltro, so that

> I might not only adopt Giuliano's arguments but also explore other possibilities that the case presented, and not only see what is presented but what opposing argument is revealed by the technique of contradiction. For when we have dissolved the arguments of the enemy and proven our own not only in fact but also in appearance, we might then properly persuade. At this point, I would probably know how to introduce the matters to be explained, how to justify the favorable points, to reinforce argument with arguments, to embellish the arguments with plentiful examples and with rounds of amplifications, and at length to

> summarize the position elaborated. Subsequently, I could press forward the noisy battle line of weaker arguments, and heap them up behind the first ones, and thereafter summon forth from a multitude of others a very vehement argument that had been left behind the front lines as a sort of rear guard. Subsequently, I would be able, as I should, to enumerate the points that the enemy could present in opposition, in order either to destroy them or to weaken their effect on the listeners. I could, moreover, add weight to the burden of the crime by treating in an exasperated fashion persons, places, times, means, and other related circumstances. At this point it would be very easy to inveigh not only against treachery *per se* – which destroys all human society – but also against this particular treachery, declaiming eloquently against treachery's inseparable companion, ingratitude; and finally I could frighten the enemy and move the audience with barbed questions and sharp exhortations.[41]

We should be grateful that Salutati's ego was big enough that, even at the price of potentially embarrassing Zonarini, he decided to let this letter circulate in his collection, for it provides us with a detailed description of his *missive*-writing strategy. Although the matter at hand concerned Zonarini specifically, the letter implicitly struck out at the whole Italian tradition of *missive* composition, which minimized argument by abbreviating the *narratio*, and expended most of the *dictator*'s creative energy on the *salutatio*, *exordium*, and perhaps *conclusio*. Unable to argue Florence's case in person before a foreign power, Salutati realized that, if he was willing to violate the rule of brevity for the *narratio*, he could use the *missive* to present substantive justifications for his city's policies and have them read to the letters' recipients. It fell to the Florentine ambassadors to follow up with extempore replies to new objections.

Salutati's talent for writing propaganda must have derived not only from his natural gifts but also from his early training in both grammar and rhetoric. In da Moglio's classroom, besides the omnipresent manual of *ars dictaminis*, Salutati may have read examples of the great masters of *stilus rhetoricus*, such as Thomas of Capua and Pier della Vigna.[42] Thence he learned "the power of a letter." As

[41] Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:171–172.

[42] To find anything comparable to Salutati's *missive*, we must go back to the first half of the thirteenth century and the papal and imperial chanceries. Laurie Shepard, *Courting Power: Persuasion and Politics in the Early Thirteenth Century* (New York and London, 1999), has analyzed the epistolary interchanges between popes and Frederick II and the use of sophisticated arguments in an expanded *narratio*. The destruction of the Hohenstaufen power in Italy, however, brought this epoch in the history of *ars dictaminis* to a close.

brilliant as his contribution to the composition of the *missive* form was, though, Salutati had perfected a medieval form of discourse, whose importance in Italian diplomacy after him would decline.

Humanism, however, gained an immense and unforeseen impetus as a result of Salutati's success. Previous Florentine chancellors, in traditional *dictamen* fashion, had amplified their propaganda with proverbs and quotations that encapsulated fragments of wisdom from the past. When writing to the kings of France or Naples, to the pope, or occasionally to other princes, they had abstractly referred to a historic tradition of friendship prevailing between Florence and the other power. My examination of much of the enormous surviving medieval Italian production of public letters indicates, however, that concrete historical themes never played much of a role in interpreting current policies. Even Cola da Rienzo's correspondence, redolent as it might have been with vague associations of an ancient Roman past, provided few historical details to underwrite his policies. By contrast, Salutati's thematic development of ancient and medieval history served him as a way of interpreting and authorizing Florentine foreign policy. Salutati not only threw contemporary events into perspective by drawing explicit historical parallels, but he relied on ancient and medieval history to provide causative explanations for current events as well.

Several humanist historians in the previous two generations had asserted history's moral purpose. Mussato and Cermenate had said nothing but Ferreto had believed in the didactic purpose of recent history while Petrarch, despairing of guidance from the recent past, had turned to the ancients. Having to justify the policies of his government, Salutati gave the didactic mission of history other purposes. For over three decades, in splendid, accessible, and widely disseminated writings, he demonstrated the importance of knowing both the modern and the ancient past for understanding the present. More than this, by explaining Florentine foreign policy in various contexts as driven by its Roman origins, he offered his fellow citizens a way of conceiving of the republic's future conduct of foreign policy. He manipulated his historical material to suit his purposes; in doing so, though, he bestowed on his generation an inestimable gift, the vision of their current political life in a historical dimension.

The new thematic of the *missive* grew out of the problem of creating credible propaganda in a war against the Church. The two central themes of *missive* war propaganda in the first three-quarters of the

century had been Florence's defense of liberty against tyranny and its defense of Guelfism. In a sense the second theme incorporated the first: Guelfs (traditionally the party of the pope) were opposed to Ghibellines (the party of the emperor) but because historically communes had been fighting the imperial effort to dominate the peninsula, Guelfism had become linked to the defense of communal freedom.

War with the pope, the leader of the Guelf party, however, rendered the association of communal government with Guelfism untenable, and Salutati had to find a new way of depicting to Florence's advantage the issues involved in the city's struggle with its enemy. His initial plan, in the fall and early winter of 1375, was to appeal to other Tuscan cities by emphasizing that the papal armies fighting against Florence consisted of *barbari* from north of the Alps. In October, he made his appeal for Pisa's support against the *barbari*, threatening that just as the Greek city-states had lost their freedom to Philip of Macedon, so "divided in our defense, we will lose our beloved liberty."[43] In a *missive* to the pope the previous July Salutati had claimed liberty as a hereditary right of Tuscans. By December, he was extending the claim, calling on the cities of the Patrimony to revolt because they were "Italians, whose right it is to command and not to serve."[44]

By the end of 1375, Salutati had formulated a program of propaganda depicting the leaders of the Church as tyrants and their soldiers as barbarians eager to oppress Italians, who enjoyed an inalienable right to freedom. On January 4, 1376, in a letter (significantly) to the Romans, Salutati took a further step: he recalled to his correspondents the numerous examples of their ancient Roman ancestors who had sacrificed themselves for freedom. A month later, he followed up by referring to ancient barbarian enemies whom Rome had beaten and for the first time referred to Florence in a cursory fashion as the daughter of Rome. Within a few months, Florence's status as Rome's daughter emerged as both an explanation of the war against the Church and a justification for Florence's defending not only its own freedom, but that of any other Italian people struggling for

[43] *Miss.*, fol. 16v (October, 22, 1375) (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 50).

[44] *Miss.*, XVI, fol. 51v. The letter to Ancona of February 1376 reflects the extension of this right to liberty to all Italians.

liberty. At the same time, Salutati adduced events from Roman history to prove the evils of tyranny and the benefits of freedom. To vindicate the claim that Italians had a hereditary claim to freedom, he evoked at points the image of a pre-Roman Italy replete with free city-states, which the greatest military power on earth could absorb only by federating with them.[45]

Because official Florentine condemnation of *Gallici* as *barbari* was ruffling the feathers of the French monarchy, in April 1376, in an apologetic letter to the French king, Salutati obfuscated the issue by introducing a historical explanation to prove the deep feeling that Florence nourished for the French crown. Insisting on the historic ties binding the two peoples, he pointed to Florence's support of Charles of Anjou's conquest of the *Regno*:

> this devotion ... exposed a strong and hearty band of Florentines in the battle line fighting for Charles the First, king of Jerusalem and of Sicily, against Manfred and Conradin; and after the death of this man of happy memory, kings Charles II and Robert received an infinite amount of aid from us.[46]

Just a few days before this letter, with Florence fearing an invasion by the Angevin king of Hungary, Salutati had written to that king recalling

> when formerly the aforesaid Charles of undying memory, who, if we remember correctly, was your great grandfather, forcefully expelled the Teutons in a series of successful battles with the help of a large band of Florentines – a fact we humbly recall – from the territories of Apulia, Calabria or [using ancient Roman names for the specific areas] Lucania, Campania, and the lands of the Samnites and Bruttians, where they were raging like an epidemic.[47]

By September 1376, Salutati also included in his praise of the Hungarian Angevins a recognition of their Carolingian heritage.[48] Although Florentine propaganda during the Milanese wars (1390-1402) was less marked by historical references, Florence's identification with ancient Rome seems to have been taken for granted by that time. To Milanese accusations in 1389 that Florence had plotted the

[45] See the letter to Ancona above in the text as well as the letter to Chiusi (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 51, n. 3).

[46] BAV, *Capponi*, 147, fol. 16 (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 45–46).

[47] *Miss.*, XVII, fol. 11v (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 46, and especially n. 17).

[48] *Miss.*, fol. 67v (Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 47).

murder of Giangaleazzo Visconti, Salutati retorted that such treachery was unthinkable for a people of Roman descent, and he cited an ancient Roman precedent.[49] The previous year, to distinguish the Florentine tie to Rome from that of all other Italian cities, including Milan, he repeated the legend of Dardanus, who, leaving Fiesole to found Troy, initiated a circular succession of foundations, from Troy to Rome and from Rome back to Florence.[50]

The propagandistic benefit deriving from Florence's claim to be a direct heir of ancient Rome seemed important enough in 1396 for Antonio Loschi, now in the Visconti chancery, to deny its validity in his invective against the city. The attack spurred Salutati, already interested in the question, to seek to establish definitively both who had founded Florence and approximately when. He would include the results in his reply to Loschi, the *Invectiva contra Antonium Luschum Vicentinum*, in 1403.

The configuration of domestic and foreign political forces, as well as Salutati's own intellectual development, led him to construct a very different historical background as the interpretive framework for the wars of the last ten years of his life.[51] By late 1396, Salutati refurbished for a new war the traditional conceptions of Guelfism and Ghibellinism, amplifying their historical associations. Early in 1397, writing to King Ladislaus of Naples in the name of the republic, he reassured the king that the recent Franco-Florentine treaty had not been directed against him. How could Florence forget that the young king's ancestor had founded the Guelf regime, which currently ruled the city?[52] In May, the chancellor traced for the Roman pope Florence's record of defending the Church, beginning with its struggle against Frederick II.[53] To Pietro dei Rossi, Guelf "liberator" of Parma, Salutati exulted in 1403 that the city had now regained its freedom after sixty years of tyranny.[54] A month before his death, in a letter to the French king, while acknowledging Sulla as founder of

[49] *Miss.*, XXII, fol. 76v.

[50] *Miss.*,XXI, fol. 24v. On the myth, see Nicolai Rubinstein, "The Beginnings of Political Thought in Florence," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5 (1942): 198–227.

[51] Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 68–69, for the political elements involved. Salutati's intellectual development over the last decade is discussed below.

[52] BCS, 5.8.8, fol. 57v.

[53] Ibid., fol. 73v.

[54] *Miss.*, XXVI, fol. 33.

Florence, Salutati praised Charlemagne as its second founder, stressed his crowning by Pope Hadrian (an error; it was Leo III), and provided an extended account of the Angevin relationship to the city.[55]

With the death of Coluccio Salutati, *missive* ceased to be a key element in Florentine foreign policy. Ambassadors not only became once again the primary spokesmen for Florentine policy abroad, as they had been before Salutati's chancellorship, but assumed a greater role than ever. Even if only indirectly, however, Salutati's accomplishments in *ars dictaminis* contributed to the creation of an attitude favorable to the diffusion of humanism. Salutati's historicizing interpretation of Florentine foreign policy opened the way for contemporaries, and first and foremost his fellow Florentines, to envisage the study of history as having a practical importance beyond personal moral improvement. While humanism continued to promise that the study of the ancients led to moral goodness, Salutati demonstrated that knowledge of history afforded a better understanding of contemporary politics and offered lessons for political leaders seeking to guide the future of the state.

3

Salutati's failure to maintain contact with the aging Petrarch in no way diminished the reverence that he felt for the great man's achievement. But already by 1379, Salutati was trying to modify gracefully the exaggerated judgment that he had pronounced in the immediate aftermath of Petrarch's death five years before, that Petrarch had been greater in prose than Cicero and more gifted in poetry than Virgil.[56] Noticeably eager to qualify his praise, he now granted that Cicero had exceeded Petrarch in oratorical eloquence but stressed that such eloquence was no longer necessary in the modern age, except in preaching. Rather,

> I would think that you and others admire what Petrarch wrote in that quiet kind of composition that we use when closeted in our houses in the narrowness (*gurgustiis*) of our studies, where in a more tranquil mood

[55] BCS, 5.8.8, fol. 129. Cf. Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 71. For the relative unimportance of Florence's Roman origin in the *missive* of this last decade, see ibid.

[56] Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:182–83.

> Cicero and the other ancient orators committed to writing what they delivered in the courtroom or at the podium.[57]

Salutati did not doubt that as an orator Cicero was unrivaled, but in that "quiet genre of speaking," he was not superior to Petrarch. Besides, Petrarch possessed a gift for poetry that Cicero could not match.

By the same token, while Virgil might have been superior to Petrarch in poetry, he certainly was not his equal in prose, which, moreover, was a form of expression superior to poetry.

> It is a wonderful thing to write poetry, but the most wonderful, believe me, is to flow forth in prose style full of praise and thoughts. Just as a river differs from the sea, so consider poems less than prose works.[58]

Consequently, Salutati concluded, "wherever you turn, you must confess that Petrarch was not inferior to Virgil or Cicero."[59] Given, though, that in a well-known ancient work the talents of Virgil and Cicero in their respective genres had been contrasted with their failure in the other's, to call Petrarch a better poet than Cicero and a better orator than Virgil was to damn him with faint praise.[60]

Salutati's belief in the superiority of prose points to a major change in the development of early humanism. As we have seen, humanism began in poetry in the middle of the thirteenth century, and poetry continued to play an important role in humanist writing down to Petrarch's time. But the chronology of Petrarch's Latin poetic work indicates that he largely abandoned Latin poetry by the 1350s. Religious scruples may have been at work in Petrarch's case, but a sharp diminution in poetry writing generally from about this time onward requires a broader explanation, one that would encompass a parallel phenomenon occurring in the vernacular.[61]

---

[57] Ibid., 1:340.

[58] Ibid., 1:338: "Magnum fateor, versibus scribere, sed maximum, crede michi, prosaico stilo cum laudibus plenisque sententiis exundare. Quantum flumen a pelago differt, tantum carmina prosis credito fore minora." See also the same position in 1405–06 (Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:143 and 167).

[59] Ibid., 1:342: "ut quocunque te verteris, Petrarcam nec Virgilio nec Tullio minorem oporteat confiteri."

[60] The ancient source for this judgment is Seneca the Elder, *Controversiarum*, III, praef., 8: "Ciceronem eloquentia sua in carminibus destituit; Vergilium illa felicitas ingenii sui in oratione soluta reliquit."

[61] Nevertheless, compared with the second quarter of the fifteenth century, when he was writing, the Venetian physican, Pietro Tommasi (b. 1375/80), thought that Latin poetry had been flourishing in the late fourteenth century when he was young:

For purposes of the present discussion, however, let us focus on Latin humanism alone. Humanism proceeded by laying claim to a succession of genres. The movement began with poetry; prose genres followed. By at least 1350, humanists had discovered that the hegemony of *ars dictaminis* could be challenged in any kind of prose writing outside the political sphere. Petrarch, the leader of the movement, at the same time invited his followers to develop personal styles, and the freedom proved exhilarating. By contrast, poetry seemed to offer little room for innovation, and Petrarch's poetic achievements themselves may have discouraged competition.

Salutati's pronouncement on the relative value of prose and poetry reflects something of the excitement felt by contemporary scholars at the widening possibilities for using classicizing prose. Subsequent generations of humanists would continue to rise to the challenge of developing personal styles, but for most of them that would be a matter of constructing a personal language in relation to the Ciceronian idiom. Although the fortunes of Latin poetry rose somewhat in the latter half of the fifteenth century, it would never recapture the center stage that it had once held by default.

We must remember that what appears to us an obsessive concern with prose style made sense within the assumptions governing the movement from Petrarch onwards. Admittedly, for professionals, a reputation for stylistic excellence had pecuniary benefits. But a desire for financial gain was not primarily what drove humanism. The humanist educational process, at least in theory, aimed at endowing individual personality with its own voice. Tied to a man's character,

---

Ernst Walser, *Poggius Florentinus: Leben und Werke* (Berlin, 1914), 434. Written to Francesco Barbaro, the letter reads: "Memini namque in adolescentia mea regnasse quandam celi influentiam, qua innumeri poete pullulare viderentur, fuit Laurentius monachus noster, Petrus Mantuanus, Thomas Siculus plerique alii sub quibus perplurimi floridissimi adolescentes nedum tota Italia sed mirum dictu trans Alpes etiam militabant. Omnia versus erant et versus equidem virgiliani ut non unum sed mille probe dixisses Virgilios mox resurrecturos. Sed quam primum ardor ille cum autoribus suis pene subito extincti sunt. Preter hunc quidem Luscum nostrum, cui nusquam pro ingenio suo status accessit, reliquum nihil est ex illa tempestate. Perinde successit alia in qua maiestas dicendi que romano cum imperio exciderat, visa est longo postliminio aut exilio dixeris sub Ciceroniano insignio in sedem suam restitui. Redundabant omnia oratoriis complebantur omnes Italie civitates exercitationibus et officine quedam Grecorum adiungebantur." On Tommasi, see Margaret L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton, 1986), 434–36.

As for vernacular poetry, it would be difficult to identify any major poet from Petrarch down to the second half of the fifteenth century.

his manner of speaking was taken as providing a reading of his soul. Even after 1400, with the advent of what I will call the "first Ciceronianism," no humanist sought to duplicate Cicero's style slavishly, because in a real sense humanists had come to believe that style established one's identity.

Salutati's commitment to the superior eloquence of prose may have derived in part from his awareness that he himself lacked a poetic gift. In any case, an examination of his few surviving poems in Latin and vernacular confirms that he was no Petrarch. His lack of talent in poetry was only one of a number of differences between him and the master. Whereas Petrarch indulged almost compulsively in self-reflection, Salutati seldom bothered. Whereas Petrarch's incessant reconstruction of his autobiography makes it difficult to separate the person from the persona that he sought to create, Salutati disappears after his early forties beneath the mantle of a Stoic sage.

Hostile to contemporary formal philosophy, Petrarch enunciated a series of insights into human nature that, while he readily used them as a basis for practical counsel, he never probed for their metaphysical implications. Very personal in his approach to all but theological issues, he demonstrated a surprising flexibility of thought and willingness not to force a point. Where he felt that a threat to Christian orthodoxy existed, he could be acerbic and even brutal, but he otherwise exhibited a tolerance of the opinion of others unusual for his time and worthy of Castellion in the sixteenth century.[62] As he wrote after praising the life of solitude in his *De vita solitaria*:

> I will not, however, be so insistent on my plans nor such a relentless supporter of my opinions as to believe that others are mad or force them to swear by my words. Many can be forced to confess, but not to believe. No liberty is greater than the liberty to think. As I claim it for myself, so I do not deny it to others. Let the intention of everyone be good, as it can be, or holy; I am unwilling to be the judge of the human conscience which is something hidden and deep.[63]

[62] As a debating technique, however, Petrarch was prone to identify an opponent's position with heterodox associations: Carol Quillen, *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine, and the Language of Humanism* (Michigan, 1998), 165–69.

[63] Francesco Petrarca, *De vita solitaria*, in Petrarch, *Prose*, 340: "Nec tamen usque adeo propositi improbus sententieque tenax sim ut desipere alios putem, vel in verba iurare cogam mea; ad fatendum multi, ad credendum nemo cogitur. Nulla maior quam iudicii libertas, hanc itaque michi vindico, ut aliis non negem. Sit sane, potest enim esse, sit honesta, sit sancta omnium intentio; esse autem occultissime profundissimeque rei humane conscientie iudex nolim."

Salutati, by contrast, had a dialectical turn of mind. Well-trained in dialectic in his youth, he invited his correspondents to raise issues for him to resolve. Once choosing his side in a debate, he mustered all the favorable arguments and threw himself into the fray, often assuming exaggerated stances. If he later regretted having gone too far, he never confessed it but simply moved on, passing over his earlier position in silence or subtly shifting his ground, as he had on the subject of Petrarch's reputation. Consequently, although for different reasons, Salutati's intellectual biography is almost as inaccessible as that of Petrarch.

A good deal of Petrarch's impetus to reform derived from his sense of being exiled in an age of moral mediocrity, separated by a temporal crevasse of a thousand years from the great men of antiquity. Better-adjusted and gregarious, Salutati felt relatively comfortable as a denizen of the fourteenth century. Nor did he embrace Petrarch's notion of the "Dark Ages." For him, the centuries intervening between antiquity and the present had been more like an arctic summer evening, with the thirteenth century as the brief night before the rising of the sun with Mussato and Geri. Although Salutati objected that the technical language of contemporary logicians obscured reality, he showed no reluctance to read scholastic commentaries on Aristotle and borrowed from scholastic theologians in constructing his own philosophical positions.

Besides a willingness to make an accommodation with the Scholastics, Salutati demonstrated a more conservative mentality in other ways. Apart from Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*, where ancient precedent encouraged it, Petrarch was largely immune to the medieval attraction to allegory. As we have seen in chapter 6, he believed that the ancient poets had hidden theological, scientific, and moral truths within their poetry, but that what theological wisdom they had possessed had derived only from human speculation. At the same time, he instinctively shied away from exploring allegories for truths of a moral or natural–scientific character. By contrast, as his monumental, unfinished *De laboribus Herculis* testifies, Salutati enthusiastically pursued the study of allegory in ancient poetry, believing, apparently down to the last ten years of his life, that at points the pagan poets were directly inspired by the Holy Spirit. Only in 1397 did he make an unequivocal break with that view, endorsed earlier by Albertino Mussato, in order to follow Petrarch and Boccaccio in denying to the

pagan poets any insight into Christian truth.[64] Unlike Petrarch as well, Salutati's writings until the last years reflected a penchant for etymological investigations, a favorite device of medieval grammarians. Salutati drew on the works of medieval lexicographers in his search for causative explanations: the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville; the *Catholicon* of Balbus; the *Lexicon* of Papias; and the *Magnae derivationes* of Uguccione of Pisa, together with the *De nominibus hebraicis* of St. Jerome and the *Interpretationes nominum Hebraicorum* of Alcuin. Salutati's orthographic concern, that is, his intention to establish the original spelling of Latin words, appears closely linked to his etymological interests, as does his attempt to purify ancient texts. If etymology unlocked the truth concealed in a word, it became imperative to establish both the correct reading of a passage and the proper spelling of the word actually used by the ancient author.[65]

Salutati never elaborated a detailed conception of imitation, but it is safe to assume that he embraced Petrarch's eclectic approach to Latin style.[66] Like Petrarch's, Salutati's stylistic expression depended on the subject matter, but his range of styles was less diverse. His earliest surviving letter evinces a confident use of Latin beyond that of leading members of the Florentine humanist circle, but it is difficult to see in the correspondence of later years a significant tendency to classicize further.[67]

In 1392, an unexpected gift from Pasquino de' Capelli, the Milanese chancellor, a long-sought manuscript of Cicero's *Ad familiares*, delighted Salutati, and he wrote a letter to Pasquino expressing his heartfelt thanks. It is fair to expect that Salutati would have been at his classical best under such circumstances.

> Tu me, quod summis semper desideriis concupivi, fecisti Tullianis epistolis locupletem, amplitudine muneris faciens quod reddar ad gratias pauperrimus et egenus. quantas tamen aut mente concipere valeo vel lingua proferre vel calamo designare, ex toto corde et ex totis viribus meis ago; affectu tamen illas cunctis temporibus habiturus, ut nulla prorsus officii vicissitudo me possit huius obligationis nexibus liberare. Tu quidem *ingens* illud volumen *ingentioris* auctoris *ingentissimam*

[64] Witt, *Hercules*, 212–26 and 405–09.
[65] Ibid., 209–15 and 236–37.
[66] For a brief statement by Salutati on imitation, see ch. 9, n. 8.
[67] Witt, *Hercules*, 59–60 and 259, with bibliography. See Sylvia Rizzo's brief but cogent remarks on Salutati's style in "Il latino nell'Umanesimo," *LI* 5:390–91.

> eloquentiam epistolis complexum, quod semper optavi semperque quesivi, michi multa rescriptum diligentia transmisisti.[68]

Opening with *Tu me, quod*, Salutati demonstrated his ability to employ the inflective possibilities of Latin to generate the impression of spontaneous feeling. He dramatized the extent of his gratitude by employing a result clause, *quod ... egenus*, contrasting his inadequate supply of thanks with his enrichment (*locupletem*) by the gift. The following two sentences demonstrate one of the most distinctive aspects of Salutati's mature style: his tendency to exaggerate Senecan use of quasisynonymous clauses and parallel clauses to add sonority and measure to the line: *aut mente concipere, vel lingua proferre, vel calamo designare*; *ex toto corde et ex totis viribus*; and *quod semper optavi semperque quesivi*.

If we examine the first sentence more closely, however, we see that the second use of *quod* to introduce the result clause betrays Salutati's link to the medieval Latin tradition, as does his penchant for superlatives (*summis* and *pauperissimus*). The rare late-Latin *concupivi* and equally rare poetic word *egenus* were probably used with self-conscious pride in place of the more common *cupivi* and *egens*; but it is difficult to excuse the inelegant constructions *fecisti ... faciens* and *reddar ad gratias* (a play on the idiom *reddere gratias*, but awkward).[69]

At its classicizing best, Salutati's epistolary style, like Petrarch's, reflected at varying distances the Senecan model in form, content, and tone, but Salutati's sententious discourse lacked Seneca's pithy wisdom or the interesting, brief narrative accounts of Petrarch's first epistolary collection. While Petrarch matched Salutati's moral didacticism in his *Seniles*, he did not use his correspondence to display his learning through detailed scholarly disquisitions, as did Salutati.

In the discussions of philosophical and theological issues that he undertook late in life, moreover, Salutati abandoned any pretense at

---

[68] Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:389: "Oh what I have always passionately wanted! By the generosity of your gift you have made me rich with the letters of Cicero, rendering me poverty-striken and destitute in giving you thanks. With all my heart and strength, however, I offer as many thanks as I am able to conceive in thought, utter with my tongue, or describe with my pen. Moreover, I will always utter them with love, so that no change of status whatsoever will free me from this tie of obligation. You have sent me this huge, most carefully written volume by a very great author, containing the supreme eloquence in his letters, which I have always desired and always sought."

[69] The playful use of use of comparative and superlative (*ingens ... ingentioris ... ingentissimam)* seems forced.

classicizing style. While such a development was consistent with his disposition to wrestle with ideas, his positions on these kinds of issue only emerged in his writings after 1390, suggesting that his ideas may have been nourished by discussions with leading scholastic thinkers present in the city at that time: Biagio Pelacani, Jacopo da Forlì, and Marsilio of Santa Sophia, men who came to Florence in the late 1380s and early 1390s with the revival of the *studio*.[70]

To express himself on philosophical and theological questions, he had in fact no other language available than the scholastic one. At points in his correspondence and in various tracts, especially his *De nobilitate legum et medicine*, he wrote as a Scholastic without the slightest scruple. His use of philosophical concepts and argumentation occasionally revealed the self-taught amateur at work, but as the analysis will show, with the help of a direct knowledge of the works of Aquinas and Scotus, he was able to develop Petrarch's stress on the centrality of the will in the human personality into a respectable philosophical position.

The congeniality of scholastic thought was for Salutati of a piece with his sense of the interpenetration of natural and supernatural reality. In 1399–1400 he was thrilled by the appearance in large areas of northern and central Italy of the *Bianchi*, a popular movement marked by an exaggerated piety, frequently including mystical experiences.[71] At least in the last ten years of his life, Salutati came to

[70] On the reorganization of the Florentine university in 1385, see Francesco Novati, "Sul riordinamento dello studio fiorentino nel 1385," *Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana* 4 (1896): 318–23, who provides the texts. For the *studio* in the second half of the Trecento, see Gene Brucker, "Florence and Its University, 1348–1434," in *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E.H. Harbison*, ed. T.K. Rabb and J.E. Seigel (Princeton, 1969), 220–36. For the *studio* in the years immediately after 1385, see Enrico Spagnesi, "I documenti costitutivi della provvisione del 1321 allo statuto del 1388," *Storia dell'Ateneo fiorentino: Contributi di Studio*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1986), 1:138–44; and Gian Carlo Garfagnini, "Città e studio a Firenze nel XIV secolo: Una difficile convivenza," *Critica storica* 25 (1988): 195–97.

On the three scholars, see Witt, *Hercules*, 293–95. On Salutati's reading in contemporary natural sciences and philosophy, see my "Coluccio Salutati and Contemporary Physics," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38 (1977): 667–72, and *Hercules*, 295–96. On the influence of Scotus and Aquinas, see ibid., 216–18, 296–98, and 345–46.

For general influences of nominalist philosophical and theological tendencies on Salutati, see Charles Trinkaus, "Coluccio Salutati's Critique of Astrology in the Context of His Natural Philosophy," *Speculum* 64 (1989): 54–68.

[71] On Salutati and the *Bianchi* movement, see Witt, *Hercules*, 355–56. On the *Bianchi* generally, see Daniel F. Bornstein, *The Bianchi of 1399: Popular Devotion in Late Medieval Italy* (Ithaca, 1993).

envisage religious landscapes inaccessible to Petrarch. To explain them, he needed the Dante of the *Commedia* as his companion and guide.

4

This characterization of Salutati's mentality suggests that Petrarch had great but nonetheless limited influence on him. If one looks beyond Petrarch's deeply religious orientation, to his antipathy to dialectic, formal philosophy, allegory, and etymological thinking, he appears closer to Salutati's disciples than to Salutati himself. But while comparisons between Petrarch and Salutati might tend to make Salutati appear regressive, it is important to recognize that the Florentine chancellor contributed to the development of humanism not only by raising the consciousness of his generation about the importance of historical knowledge, but in other ways as well. For one thing, by the last two decades of his life, Salutati's study in the Piazza dei Peruzzi had become the nerve center of humanism. By virtue of his official position, he had at his command a staff of reliable letter carriers who, in addition to bearing official correspondence to all parts of Europe, could be asked to convey humanist letters and manuscripts.[72] Young humanists even at great distances sought Salutati's friendship, not merely because of his scholarly distinction but because of the weight his recommendations carried in the job market for notaries and probably for teachers from Naples northward. Almost invariably, the lines of communication between humanists passed through Florence.

While Petrarch was not as ignorant of medieval writers as he would have had people believe, he had scant respect for the writings of anyone who belonged to the centuries after antiquity. Salutati was far less radical. He considered later literature, while not equal to ancient eloquence, nonetheless part of the same tradition. His more catholic attitude afforded a sweeping perspective of the development

[72] On the Florentine messenger service, see Witt, *Salutati and His Letters*, 19–20. We can perhaps assume that the new interest in humanistic studies at the French court and the frequent contact between Florentine humanists and learned members of the court were connected with the frequency of diplomatic contacts between the two states during the Milanese wars.

of Latin literature that was denied to Petrarch. His grouping of Latin writers, based on his judgment of their literary excellence, roughly by centuries from ancient Rome down to his own day, reflects this sense of continuity.

The periodization of Latin literature was the vital step to take if humanists were to overcome the assumption that ancient Latin as a language had been unchanging, an assumption that led them simply to treat ancient Latin as a fund of styles. Once one understood that ancient Latin literature could be analyzed in terms of periods, one could move on to observe that the literature of a particular epoch shared common linguistic characteristics. One might then come to understand that the Latin language itself had undergone significant change over the centuries of antiquity. Salutati's last letters contained this conception in embryo, for others to develop.

Two letters written by Salutati in January and February 1394 were his first effort to treat Latin literary culture as a whole. One of the most galling aspects of contemporary Latin for the humanists was the use of *vos* in addressing a single individual in contrast to the classical *tu*. Presenting the results of his historical investigation to discover when the current usage entered the language, Salutati began by enumerating examples of the consistent use of *tu* for individuals in antiquity.[73] He noted that at least as late as the early fifth century, Sidonius always used *tu* in such cases. While in the sixth century Ennodius occasionally employed *vos*, at the very end of that century Gregory the Great still used *tu* in his *Pastorales*, *Dialogi*, and other works, but not in his letters. Here his usage did not seem to have been consistent: those to Augustine of Canterbury were in the singular, but other letters addressed to individuals used the plural form. The latter cases, Salutati explained, might be letters intended for multiple dispatch but with the name of only one individual provided in the register. Salutati also granted that Gregory might have used the plural form in order to flatter his correspondent – although without explaining wherein the flattery would have lain. The usage of the chancery of Pope Nicholas II in the ninth century appeared to be inconsistent, but Salutati did not know what led the pope to use one form rather than the other in particular instances.

[73] Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:408–19. For the dating of these two letters, see the summary of the correspondence of Salutati and Conversini (Witt, *Hercules*, 257–58, n. 117).

While in the first of the two letters on the subject Salutati did not establish the point at which the *vos* form became common, in a third letter, written a few months later, he seemed willing to say that the ancient custom of using *tu* for all individuals had been "faithfully observed until a very few centuries ago," perhaps an allusion to the pivotal twelfth century, when to his mind a break in the Latin literary tradition had occurred.[74] His extended disquisition on the changes in the use of *tu* over time might have been one of the sources for Salutati's general observation in the last year of his life that language underwent historical development.

The perspective on Latin literary history necessary to provide a survey of the vicissitudes of the use of *tu*, served Salutati in 1395, a year after he wrote the three letters, to create a chronological sketch of the development of Latin writing from antiquity down to his own time, together with an assessment of the relative quality of the work produced in each period. As I mentioned in chapter 4, already early in the fourteenth century Geremia da Montagnone had distinguished between *poeti* and *versilogi*, using 600 C.E. as the dividing line but without explanation. Subsequently, Petrarch spoke with chronological imprecision about the decadence of literature in the centuries after the great pagan authors.[75] Salutati's discussion of Latin authors from antiquity to his own day in a letter of August 1395, therefore, offered the first literary history of Latin literature, and his assessment of the literary quality of the different stages of development has remained almost unchanged down to this century.

His account of the history of Latin eloquence, included in this letter to Cardinal Bartolomeo Oliari, identified the centuries before and after the birth of Christ as marking the ultimate in literary achievement:

> the height of eloquence is to be set without question in Cicero and his times, in which century many very famous men flourished with their ability to speak. Consider briefly both that prince of eloquence, Marcus Tullius, and those lights of oratory who competed with him in that period, and you will see that modernity is surpassed by any one of them by as much as Cicero surpassed them.[76]

[74] Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:438.

[75] On Petrarch's ambivalence about changes in the ancient Latin language, see Witt, *Hercules*, 263–65.

[76] Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:80.

Salutati continued with a list of orators and writers contemporary with Cicero. Although writers of the next century, primarily Seneca, Valerius Maximus, and Livy, did not quite reach the majesty of Cicero, they were nonetheless men of great eloquence.

The writers of the next several centuries demonstrated for Salutati how eloquence still continued to flower, but by the same token how much majesty it had lost since its height with Cicero. In the fourth and fifth centuries, writers like Augustine, Jerome, and Ausonius managed "to establish continuity in eloquence for about a century," after which eloquence declined, as the works of Bernard, Peter of Blois, and many others revealed (*Epist.*, 3:82–83). The eloquence of the last authors could not be compared with that of the authors in the preceding groups. Finally, in Salutati's own century, certain writers had "raised themselves a bit" (*emerserunt parumper*), that is, Mussato, Geri of Arezzo, Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio (*Epist.*, 3:84). Yet who could deny that their "capacity to speak" was inferior to that of the ancients? Although Salutati entertained a certain notion of a renaissance of letters in his own century, then, his praise of contemporary writers was modest compared with his praise of the ancient pagan authors.

In charting the course of Latin eloquence between its high point in the first century B.C.E. and its diminishing quality thereafter, Salutati provided a chronological map for his disciples pursuing *vetustas*, one that encouraged them to assign hitherto isolated authors to specific epochs in the history of Latin style. This was particularly important for the perception of Cicero, because he emerged not as some unique inexplicable star, but rather as the leading figure of an age in which eloquence flourished broadly. Salutati did not yet, however, use literary history to move beyond individual styles and to reflect on the state of the Latin language embodied in individuals' writings. Although Salutati considered Petrarch as contributing to the revival of Latin style in his own century, he made no effort to reconcile that judgment with his repeated assessment that Petrarch was comparable to Cicero and Virgil.

Perhaps Salutati's most original intellectual creation was *De nobilitate legum et medicine*, finished in 1399.[77] In this work, in place of Petrarch's emphasis on the importance of the will to human nature,

[77] The work is found as *De nobilitate legum et medicine: De verecundia*, ed. Eugenio Garin, Edizione nazionale dei classici del pensiero italiano, no. 8 (Florence, 1947).

he espoused the active life of the citizen – hardly a position Petrarch himself would have supported. While it is hard to believe that Salutati did not know Petrarch's defense of the will's superiority to the intellect in the *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*, he never cited that work or gave Petrarch credit. Indeed, Salutati's immediate source was probably Scotus. Down to the 1390s, Salutati had repeatedly affirmed that the intellect was the noblest human faculty; his arguments in crucial sections of the *De nobilitate* drew heavily on Scotus and Aquinas; and he had probably become well-acquainted with those two authors through the encouragement of scholastically trained friends teaching in the *studio* at the time.[78]

Almost two decades before the *De nobilitate*, in 1381/82, Salutati had written a massive defense of the monastic life, *De seculo et religione*, in response to a correspondent's request for a work that would strengthen his resolve to maintain his monastic vows.[79] Composing in the genre of *De contemptu mundi*, Salutati mustered the panoply of traditional attacks against the world. At the time, Salutati may have had personal reasons for dark feelings about the secular world. In 1381/82 the demagogic leaders of the commune reached the height of their power and Salutati, together with other prominent people in the city, feared for their physical safety.[80]

While he never specifically renounced the position he assumed in that work, at least by 1393 Salutati was sending letters in which he warned his correspondents against the dangers of the life of seclusion.[81] The *De nobilitate legum et medicine* provided the philosophical underpinnings for a general rehabilitation of the active life. Salutati's response to a physician who claimed that medicine was superior to law, the treatise rejected Salutati's often repeated affirmation that the intellect was the noblest human faculty.[82] The new position, however,

[78] Garin's notes to the edition suggest that Aquinas was an important source throughout the work, while Scotus was drawn upon only for the sections dealing with the priority of the will over the intellect (see Witt, *Hercules*, 345, n. 52).

[79] *De seculo et religione*, ed. B.L. Ullman (Florence, 1957).

[80] Witt, *Hercules*, 205–07.

[81] Ibid., 347–52, for examples.

[82] His opponent was a certain Bernardo di ser Pistorio. His *Quaestio* is found in Universitätsbibliothek, Würzburg, M.ch.f.60, fols. 96–109. See Witt, *Hercules*, 331, n. 1, for bibliography on this treatise and the *De nobilitate*. For Salutati on the intellect as the chief human faculty, see *Hercules*, 67 and 318.

In 1398 in a letter to Pellegrino Zambeccari, Salutati seems to suggest that the intellect is the superior faculty and then immediately undercuts that position (*Hercules*, 351–52).

emerged only as the argument in the treatise progressed.

At the outset, in fact, Salutati expressly pre-empted debate on the contemplative life: a function of the intellect infused with grace, he considered the contemplative life unquestionably superior to the active one.[83] The debate concerned, rather, the active life fostered by study of the law on the one hand versus the speculative life, that is, a life devoted to employing the intellect in its natural operations, on the other. Arguing that medicine was inferior to law, he identified medicine as founded on direct contact with created objects. In contrast, law sprang from an inner experience in which we have contact with the Will of the Creator.[84]

Whereas medicine aimed at natural good and sought to benefit individuals, law strove for moral good and the benefit of the whole community.

> I am always busy with activity, aiming at the final goal so that whatever I do is advantageous to me, my family, my relatives, and what is before everything, my friends and the homeland. I act so that I can live in such a way as to help the whole of human society by my example and with my works.[85]

Those who benefited human society most were not the speculative thinkers but the lawgivers who instituted laws, thereby guiding their societies long after their own deaths.

At this point, Salutati almost irresistibly crossed over the boundary that he himself had laid down, and human intellect as such, not merely its speculative dimension, became the focus of attack. He never specifically retracted his earlier praise of contemplation, but a new set of arguments strove to establish the superiority of the active life over the contemplative one. Granted that within the human being intellect and will functioned together to produce a conscious act, the will's role was superior to the intellect's.[86] Before the first movement of the intellect, the will's desire to know set the intellect in motion. In the first movement, the possible intellect, passive insofar as it received the species of external objects presented by the sense organs, offered those species as intelligible objects to the will. Because

[83] *De nobilitate*, 38–40.

[84] The epistemological argument is carried forward in a number of places in the *De nobilitate* (Witt, *Hercules*, 337–40).

[85] *De nobilitate*, 180.

[86] Ibid., 186–92.

those objects were not only beings but also goods, the will commanded the intellect to contemplate them, to understand not only what they were but also in what manner they were. At this point, the will determined what things would be chosen or pursued among that which was knowable. But the will was perfectly free to choose or not to choose, and its object was not the mental conception presented to it by the intellect but rather the good that it found in the thing known. The intellect played the ancillary role of providing information to the will so that the will might perform its function of directing the human being to specific actions.

The pursuit of the good as the *motus animi* of the human being was the key to Salutati's conception of the final beatitude of man. Were the goal of human beings total knowledge of all things, our beatitude would eternally elude us, because even after death such knowledge remained unattainable: God's infinite essence could never be comprehended but by Himself. Rather, our final destiny was not to know God but rather to enjoy Him eternally, a function properly associated with the will.[87] In this enjoyment of God, in Whom all individual goods were united, the human will was satisfied; the action of the intellect was confined to contemplating God as infinite good. All Salutati's other arguments for the superiority of law over medicine can be traced to this analysis of the true end of human activity and of the relationship between will and intellect in human action.

The relationship of the two central human faculties also provided a framework for understanding Salutati's evolving conception of the Christian citizen. The highest end of the active life in this world lay in service to one's fellow citizens. From the early days of his perma-

[87] Ibid., 190: "Verum quoniam verus et extremus hominis finis non est cognoscere sive scire, sed illa suprema beatitudo, que videre est Deum, sicuti est, visoque frui, visumque diligere illique eternaliter coherere per dilectionem que sic unit diligentem atque dilectum quod qui per illam adheret Deo unus spiritus est cum eo, nec hoc adipisci possumus scientia vel speculatione humana sed Dei grati per virtutes et operationes, certum est ad illam, veram felicitatem activam vitam, cuius voluntas principium est, non speculativam pertinere, que perficitur intellectu, et in ea ipsa beatitudine nobilior et formalior est voluntatis actus, qui dilectio est, quam actus intellectus, qui contemplatio sive visio dici potest. Terminatum est enim intelligere quotiens infinitum illud bonum beatificum comprehendit, terminatum est equidem nec potens est ulterius proficisci." In his less polemical moments, Salutati argued that the two faculties and two ways of life could not be sharply separated. His clearest summary of that position is found in the Zambeccari letter of 1398 (Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:305–08).

nent residency in Florence, Salutati's use of the word *caritas* for patriotism had taken on Christian associations. While by nature men sensed a common bond with other men and affection for them, Christ demanded more: Christians must love their fellow men as themselves and embrace even their enemies with that love. But as the example of Christ, who left Egypt to suffer death in Israel, showed, Christians owed their greatest obligation to the *patria*.[88] Christians had a greater chance of successfully fulfilling patriotic obligations than non-Christians did. Enlightened by divine revelation as to the proper ordering of goals and aided by divine influence, they were able to perform the good works necessary for their salvation. Had Aristotle known the true purpose of life, he would never have considered speculation superior to activity.[89]

How much influence did Salutati's scholastically structured declaration of the superiority of the will over the intellect and of the active life over the contemplative one have on his successors? The philosophical abstractions in which Salutati dealt were not to the tastes of those young rhetoricians, but it must have been comforting for them to know that such unambiguous conclusions, so favorable to their own rhetorical enterprise, could be established by a methodology other than their own.

If the conclusions of the *De nobilitate* themselves may have inspired Salutati's disciples to consider the will a creative force oriented toward political life, however, within his own evolving thought the will's very freedom became problematic. The human will not only derived its vitality and proper orientation from Divine Grace, but it had to function within a hierarchical framework of cause and effect, which Salutati had already described in the *De fato et fortuna*, written in 1396 in the aftermath of his wife's death. In that work, aimed at formulating a coherent theory of universal causation, Salutati viewed the historical experience of human beings through a theological prism. That Dante helped to bring his views into focus is beyond question.[90] Under Dante's guidance, Salutati identified human history as one aspect of God's grand design for the universe, an inter-

[88] See Witt, *Hercules*, 343.

[89] *De nobilitate*, 270.

[90] On the links between his wife's death and his interest in Dante, see Witt, *Hercules*, 313–15. The text for the *De fato et fortuna* is found in Concetta Bianca's edition of the work, *De fato et fortuna* (Florence, 1985).

pretation of human events that would find its final elaboration in the *De tyranno* four years later.

By 1396, the savage, treacherous Fortune of Salutati's youth had become identified with Divine Providence, and even celestial forces had become its obedient servants. While all things proceeded "by fixed and immutable reason" in accordance with God's Will, and Divine Providence was everywhere at work, nonetheless the *De fato* insisted on freedom of the human will and on the existence of contingency in the universe.[91] Unable by its nature not to act freely, human free will was built into the hierarchy of causes and in its operation voluntarily contributed to the accomplishment of the universal design.[92] The will freely decided to follow the course of action that had been divinely decreed from eternity and prepared for by God's provision of all the prior elements appropriate to eliciting each specific human response. Indeed, so heavily did Salutati stress the participation of the Divine Will in the human act that it became difficult to see what the human element contributed:

> For it is written: "God operates in us will and execution." Nay, rather, since He is first cause of all things, He influences the acts of our wills far more than the will itself does; so that not only because prior in eternity and time but even because of greater activity, the whole ought to be attributed and ascribed to God.[93]

Over the previous twenty-five years, Salutati had occasionally referred to divine intervention as an explanation of a variety of events. In particular, he was convinced that the recurrent plagues that had afflicted Florence during his lifetime could ultimately be attributed to God's determination to punish the city's manifold sins. Occasionally, Salutati had cited certain historical events, particularly biblical ones, as instances of divine intervention.[94] Twice before, he had referred to Rome's domination of the world as part of the unfolding of a universal design; now, in 1396, for the first time he focused on the establishment of the Roman monarchy as that design's culmination.[95]

Heretofore Salutati, like Petrarch, seems to have felt ambivalent about Caesar's accession to power and his murder. In 1392, however,

---

[91] *De fato*, 4.
[92] Ibid., 54–56.
[93] Ibid., 51.
[94] Witt, *Hercules*, 315 and 330, for examples.
[95] Ibid., 374–75, n. 20.

his reading of the newly discovered Vercelli manuscript of Cicero's *Ad familiares* appears to have convinced him of the justice of the assassination. In thanking Capelli for having the manuscript copied for him, he wrote that he could now see "how that ruler of the whole world plunged from popular liberty into the servitude of monarchy."[96] Sometime later, in 1393 or 1394, replying to Giovanni Zambeccari, the Bolognese chancellor, who in a previous letter had apparently echoed Petrarch's denunciation of Cicero's commitment to politics, Salutati affirmed the duty of the good man and citizen to resist subversion of the state. Like Brutus and Cato, Cicero chose the best side "not by perversity or levity but by reason and council."[97]

The influence of Ciceronian republicanism extended to the Florentine *missive*, when, appealing in 1394 to the Genoese to establish civic unity or fall under the domination of a tyrant, Salutati outlined how domestic discord had brought tyranny to Rome:

> Remember, O most prudent men, where Rome was led by civil war! Do you not see that it was cast down from a popular government into miserable servitude? For what were the regimes of Caesar or of Octavian but the beginning of perpetual slavery? And what can you expect for yourselves when that lordly people, who could not be overthrown without ruining the whole world, was so weakened by the madness of civil war that it never regained the glory of its liberty?[98]

Now in the *De fato*, only a few years later, Brutus's deed no longer appeared to be simply a part of secular history, but rather was seen *sub specie aeternitatis*. In acting with evil intent to kill Caesar, Brutus had served as an instrument in the divine plan to destroy the Republic and create a monarchy. As Salutati explained in tract 2 of the work, God determined that Caesar would die when and how he would, but by the same token, because it had been "possible" for Caesar to have died in other ways, Brutus had chosen to kill Caesar of his own free will, thereby incurring responsibility for the deed.[99]

---

[96] Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:389.

[97] Ibid., 3:25.

[98] ASF, *Miss*, 23, 180v: "Recensete, viri prudentissimi, quo civile certamen deduxerit urbem Romam; nonne videtis de regimine populico precipitatam fuisse in miseram servitutem? Quid enim fuerunt Cesaris vel Octavii dominatus, nisi principium perpetue servitutis? Et quid vobis sperare potestis quando princeps ille populus, qui sine totius orbis ruina prostrari non poterat, in furore bellorum civilium sic evanuit quod nunquam in sue libertatis gloriam reascendit": cited from Daniela de Rosa, *Coluccio Salutati: Il cancelliere e il pensatore politico* (Florence, 1980), 140–41.

[99] *De fato*, 62.

In a long section in tract 3, in which Dante's vision of Roman history became Salutati's, Salutati developed the full significance of Brutus's deed. After quoting Dante at length on the all-powerful nature of Divine Providence, Salutati analyzed the Battle of Thessalia, between Brutus and Cassius on the one side and Anthony and Octavian on the other, to demonstrate that the astounding series of events leading up to the defeat of Caesar's murderers, against all odds, had been decreed by the Divine Will:

> But with the Divine Will deciding that at the coming of the true king, His Son, the world would be under one prince of princes and, since the disposition of God was the power behind worldly affairs – about which our Dante says: "Your wisdom has no means of countering her; she foresees, judges, and pursues her reign, no less god than the gods who reign elsewhere" – I say this disposition of God ordained all matters of the civil war toward the goal of a future monarchy, so that by chance and beyond the intention of the actors those things occurred that led to the end of the senatorial regime.[100]

Using the voluntary actions of human beings working toward their own goals, God manipulated the course of history for the achievement of His grand design for humanity.

Whereas the *De fato* showed how historical events in Roman history fitted into God's plan, the *De tyranno*, written in 1400, made the events surrounding Caesar's murder the focus of Salutati's effort to defend Dante's decision to place Brutus and Cassius in the depths of Hell.[101] After an argument driving ruthlessly toward the desired exculpation of Dante by means of distorted evidence and leaps in logic, the *De tyranno* arrived at the conclusion that in killing Caesar the conspirators had murdered the lawfully elected ruler of Rome, who was justly governing the Roman people. Therefore, Brutus and Cassius were properly identified as murderers of the monarch of the world, "the image as it were of divinity in the rightfulness of his rule."[102] The miserable fate of all the conspirators betrayed the work-

[100] Ibid., 201–02. The citation from Dante is *Inf.*, 7, 85–87.

[101] The *De tyranno* has been published three times: *De tyranno: Coluccio Salutatis Traktat vom Tyrannen*, ed. A. von Martin (Berlin, 1913); *Tractatus de tyranno von Coluccio Salutati*, ed. F. Ercole (Berlin, 1914); and again Ercole's *Coluccio Salutati: Il trattato De tyranno e lettere scelte* (Bologna, 1942), with Italian translation. An English translation by E. Emerton is found in his *Humanism and Tyranny: Studies in the Italian Trecento* (Cambridge, Mass., 1925). I cite from von Martin's edition.

[102] *De tyranno*, 59.

ings of the Divine Will just as did the creation of Augustus as emperor, under whose rule the world was brought into unity.

Included within this defense of Caesar and of Dante's judgment was a defense of monarchy as the ideal form of government.

> Is it not sound politics, approved by the judgment of all wise men, that monarchy is to be preferred to all other forms of government, provided only that it be in the hands of a wise and good man?[103]

Just as the heavens were ruled by one God, so human affairs were better managed the more nearly they imitated the divine order. As events after Caesar's murder had made manifest, divided power prepared the way for political chaos. Order could only be restored with the unification of power in Octavian's hands.

While a close reading of the text reveals that Salutati had no intention of defending monarchy as appropriate for governments below the imperial level, nonetheless, the theological framework that he imposed upon politics and history tended to make political acquiescence a virtue.[104] Furthermore, presenting the course of history, as both the *De fato* and *De tyranno* did, as a single development, in which pagan antiquity was overcome in the fullness of time by Christ, Salutati tended to devalue the accomplishments of pagan society. The *De nobilitate* had suggested this position as well in 1399, by finding the pagan will inferior to a will inspired by Divine Grace.

5

In the writings of his last years, Salutati's tendency to emphasize a rupture between pagan and Christian culture intensified. Certain antipagan sentiments, expressed ostensibly for polemical reasons in the *De seculo* in 1381/82, now emerged as Salutati's personal opinion. Whereas earlier he considered patriotism a form of *caritas*, now, primarily because pagans lived without the truth, Salutati defined their patriotism, untouched by Christian *caritas*, as a product of human selfishness.[105] In a letter of 1404 rejecting Aristotle's thesis that one could not have many friends, Salutati argued that the thesis per-

[103] Ibid., 1.

[104] For Salutati's limitation of his defense of monarchy to empire, see Witt, *Hercules*, 379.

[105] Ibid., 203.

tained only to the pre-Christian era, because it was possible to unite the whole of Christian society by bonds of friendship:

> It is accomplished by the perfection of Christian teaching if we do what we are commanded; for we are ordered to love our neighbor as ourselves and Christ does not command impossible things of us. Who can prevent a truly perfect society and total friendship from existing, founded on this basic belief common to all Christians?[106]

Increasingly toward the end of his life, then, Salutati tended to judge human experience by Christian standards, subordinating the secular importance of citizenship to salvific concerns and bringing into question the relevance of the study of ancient pagan culture for a Christian. Disagreement between Salutati and his young disciples, who, like Petrarch, saw a radical break between antiquity and their own generation, led him in the end to espouse positions which, if taken seriously, would have utterly discredited the humanistic effort to put antiquity to use for the advancement of modern culture.

The last controversies of Salutati's life revealed how many formerly hard-fought positions he was now prepared to abandon. His dispute with the Dominican theologian Giovanni Dominici in the spring of 1406 revolved around the Dominican's scholastic treatise, *Lucula noctis*, published in 1405 and dedicated to Salutati.[107] Born in Florence in 1355/56, the learned, eloquent Dominici resided by 1405 at the church of Santa Maria Novella in Florence, where he taught scripture and frequently preached.[108] In contrast with previous enemies of pagan writings with whom Salutati had argued, Dominici was a sophisticated opponent, who argued that for minds well-established in faith the reading of the ancient poets and philosophers was permissible. That was not the case, however, for the young or those not yet secure in their Christian convictions. We know from his *Regola del governo di cura familiare* (1401) that the Dominican was particularly alarmed at the recent humanist introduction of ancient pagan authors into the Florentine grammar schools, an innovation that he felt certain would corrupt the youth of the city.[109]

---

[106] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:20.

[107] The work is published as *Johannis Dominici Lucula noctis*, ed. E. Hunt (Notre Dame, Ind., 1940).

[108] See G. Cracco, "Banchini, Giovanni di Domenico (Giovanni Dominici, Banchetti, Giovanni)," *DBI* 5 (1963), 657–64.

[109] See ch. 5, n. 79.

Having studied the *Lucula noctis* during the winter of 1405–06, Salutati undertook an extended response but died before finishing it. Pervaded by a tone of deep piety, Salutati's reply began with an extended profession of his religious faith. Never would he engage in any argument with Dominici if he thought that his defense of the study of pagan letters would lead him to affirm anything against religion.

> As far as I am concerned, I have always been most firmly persuaded – even when I was a little boy and even more now when, by the grace of God, because of my age, I have seen more and perhaps known more – that no doctrine is more powerful than our faith and the Scriptures and that whatever contradicts it is most false; whatever departs from it, mad.[110]

His loyalty to scripture included his understanding of the holy texts as they were interpreted and preached by the Church Fathers.

> The name of Christ alone pleases me ... Who, though studies were flourishing in Greece and Italy, ... made the wisdom of this world folly.[111]

In defending the study of pagan letters for the young, Salutati proceeded by assessing the authors' role in the *trivium* and *quadrivium*. In each case, however, it became clear that he conceived of studying the pagans as subordinate to strengthening Christian faith. While the deterioration of his health – he died only a few months after writing the reply – may in part explain the subdued tone of his argument, the limited role that he assigned to the Latin poets and prose writers in the education of young people reflected the coalescence of a variety of tendencies that had been at work for a decade, undercutting his confidence in the value of the pagan authors.

Writing to a pious Christian and a severe critic of pagan letters, Salutati, the polemicist, refused to reveal the extent of his own doubts about the value of the cause to which he had dedicated a good deal of his life. But faced with the brash, young Poggio Bracciolini on March 26, 1406, he was ready to go to exaggerated lengths to vindicate his position on the literary stature of Petrarch, the Christian

---

[110] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:214. I have followed the translation of Charles Trinkaus, *"In Our Image and Likeness": Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*, 2 vols. (London, 1970; rpt. 1995), 1:55.

[111] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:215.

writer, whom he regarded as more than the equal of any pagan author. "You will see that absolutely not a single teaching of any of them can survive," he wrote of the pagans.[112] They could not live virtuous lives because they lived for the wrong end. They did not know that God himself was the final object of the beatific vision and, consequently,

> they could not discourse properly or in a fashion worthy of imitation either on humanity or on moral science or ethics, which is the same thing.[113]

It is hard to know to what extent his derogatory remarks about the pagans represented genuine convictions and to what extent they were an elderly debater's effort to score points off an opponent. Whichever was the case, the statements were the logical culmination of lines of reasoning that Salutati had been pursuing over the previous decade.

In a general assessment of Trecento humanism, it is important to recall that Mussato and Salutati in their last years followed a similar trajectory in their thought. In each case, an intensification of religious feeling led to writing a treatise on universal causation, followed by a crisis of confidence in the value of a life's work. If Salutati did not end like Mussato by bitterly renouncing his humanist past, his uncertainties about the value of pagan learning for a Christian did sap his passion for its study. Against the background of these two biographies, the success of the devout Petrarch in maintaining a delicate balance between his Christian faith and his love for pagan eloquence demonstrates once again his close link to the fifteenth century, when such a position became common. The generation of humanists after Salutati, however, avoided the problem, largely by confining most of their attention to the secular sphere.

---

[112] Ibid., 4:164.

[113] Ibid. See also on this passage Charles Trinkaus, "Humanistic Dissidence: Florence Versus Milan, or Poggio Versus Valla?" in *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and C.H. Smyth, 2 vols. (Florence, 1989), 1:29–31. Trinkaus makes the point that Salutati believed in intellectual progress generally and not merely on the basis of the superiority of Christianity over pagan religions (1:28).

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE REVIVAL OF ORATORY

When humanists of the second half of the fifteenth century traced the history of their movement, they were in general agreement that the revival of antiquity began around 1400. For them, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Salutati, while preparing the way, preceded the true renaissance of ancient letters. The principal grounds for this judgment lay in the recognition by the humanists of the century's second half that the humanists of the century's early years were the first to share their own stylistic ambitions. Although modern scholarship has concentrated on the development of humanistic ideas and philological methods, the humanists' own preoccupation with the development of style deserves to be taken seriously.

1

Looking back from their vantage point in the second half of the fifteenth century, humanists were convinced that a sea change had occurred in Latin style between Salutati's generation and Bruni's. In the synoptic account of the humanist movement that Bartolomeo Platina included in his sketch of the life of his mentor, Vittorino da Feltre, he marked off the forerunners of the movement from those who brought it to flower. According to Platina's account, while scholars such as Petrarch and Vergerio had devoted their lives to retrieving many of the major writings of ancient Rome, their successors had been the first to write elegant poetry and eloquent orations:

> The Roman language ... lay in shadows for more than seven hundred years. A little before the time of Vittorino [da Feltre], Francesco Petrarch and Paolo Vergerio were seen as in some way bringing it back to light by seeking everywhere the volumes of the wisest men and restoring them to wide use by reading and transcription. And then by the labor and effort of Gasparino of Bergamo, Guarino of Verona, Leonardo of Arezzo, Poggio of Florence, Filelfo, and Vittorino together, these studies not only came to flower but reached such a splendor – whether you sought elegant poets or consummate orators – that it seemed that

> only the ingratitude and avarice of princes and peoples posed an obstacle to happiness in our time.[1]

Paolo Cortesi, writing about 1495, singled out Leonardo Bruni as the initiator of the new movement:

> He first turned the irregular practice of writing into harmonious sound and brought something more splendid to men by art. There are many oratorical virtues in him: in every genre of composition he is sober and prudent and (for those times) not uncultivated.[2]

While Cortesi admitted that Bruni's style would not meet the fastidious standards of his own day, nonetheless, compared with the writing of the masters of the previous generation, Salutati and Conversini, Bruni was eloquent.[3]

The well-known but incorrectly interpreted account of the origins of the humanist movement found in Flavio Biondo's *Italia illustrata* drew a similar line between the precursors and those who first acquired the eloquence that made possible the recovery of ancient literature and history.[4] On the authority of Leonardo Bruni himself, the

---

[1] Bartolomeo Platina, *Platinae De vita Victorini feltrensis commentariolus*, ed. E. Garin, in his *Il pensiero pedagogico dello umanesimo* (Florence, 1958), 670: "Romana enim lingua ... tenebris supra septingentesimum annum iacuit: quam quidem paulo ante Victorini aetatem, Franciscus Petrarcha et Paulus Vergerius in lucem quoquo modo deducere sunt visi, conquisitis undique doctissimorum virorum voluminibus, eisdemque vel legendo vel scribendo in usum et consuetudinem deductis. Mox vero Gasparini Bergomatis, Guarini Veronensis, Leonardi Aretini, Poggii Florentini, Philelphi Victorinique item labore et industria, non solum denuo pullularunt haec studia, verum eo incrementi devenere sive elegantes poetas, sive consummatos oratores velis, ut temporum nostrorum felicitati, nil praeterquam principum et populorum ingratitudo atque avaritia obstare videatur." Platina's work was composed between 1461 and 1463 (ibid., 730). Vergerio was a contemporary of Guarino's and Bruni's and younger than Barzizza.

[2] Paolo Cortesi, *De hominibus doctis dialogus: Testo, traduzione e commento*, ed. and trans. M.T. Graziosi (Rome, 1973), 20: "Hic primus inconditam scribendi consuetudinem ad numerosum quendam sonum inflexit et attulit hominibus nostris aliquid certe splendidius. Multae sunt in eo oratoriae virtutes, gravis est in toto genere, et prudens, et ut illis temporibus non incultus." Cortesi remarks that the writings of Giovanni Conversino and Salutati "vix semel leguntur" (24). Earlier, Cortesi comments on the crude style of Boccaccio and continues: "Eodemque modo de Johanne Ravennate et Coluccio Salutato iudicare licet, qui nunquam etiam ab orationis asperitate maestitiaque abesse potuerunt" (18).

[3] Ibid., 18: "At non videtis quantum his omnibus desit? Et cum in tanta asperitate versetur antiquitas, quantum splendorem Leonardus, quanta dicendi ornamenta attulerit."

[4] I will be drawing at length on my "Still the Matter of the Two Giovannis: A Note on Malpaghini and Conversino," *Rinascimento* 35 (1996): 179–99. There I trace

shadowy figure of Giovanni Malpaghini or Giovanni da Ravenna (1346–1422?) emerges as having played a transitional role between Petrarchan humanism and the next phase.[5] As Biondo wrote, the town of Ravenna

> gave birth at the very same time to Giovanni, grammarian and most learned rhetor. According to Leonardo Aretino [i.e., Bruni] in all things but especially in this case the weightiest and most substantial witness, he was the first by whom the studies of eloquence, now flourishing so exceedingly, had been brought back to Italy from a distant abode. This is certainly worthy knowledge, which ought to be made known by us in describing Italy.[6]

That Biondo understood Bruni to be referring to Giovanni Malpaghini is clear from a long passage in which Biondo linked Petrarch with the youthful Malpaghini, who had in fact been Petrarch's amanuensis. Biondo also made it clear that in his view (and presumably – given his hovering presence throughout the account – Bruni's as well), the new eloquence was intimately associated with the recovery of Cicero's oratorical writings and his correspondence. I quote Biondo at length:

> First of all, Francesco Petrarch, a man of great talent and great industry, began to awaken poetry and eloquence, but in that age in which we blame the dearth and lack of books more than of genius, he did not attain the flower of Ciceronian eloquence that adorns many we see in this century. For he himself, although he boasted having found the letters of Cicero written to Lentulus at Vercelli, did not know the three books of Cicero's *De oratore* and Quintilian's *Institutiones* except in fragmentary form, and likewise *Orator maior* and *Brutus de oratoribus claris*, books of Cicero, had not come to his knowledge. Giovanni of Ravenna knew the old Petrarch as a boy, and he did not have these books in any

---

the misinterpretation of this passage beginning with Remigio Sabbadini. See especially 186–89.

[5] For the date of Malpaghini's death, traditionally given as 1417, see below, p. 350.

[6] *Blondi Flavii forliviensis in Italiam illustratam* (Turin, 1527), fol. 88v: Ravenna "genuit etiam eodem tempore Ioannem grammaticum rhetoremque doctissimum, quem solitus dicere fuit Leonardus Aretinus, omni in re sed potissime in hac una gravissimus locupletissimusque testis, fuisse primus a quo eloquentiae studia tantopere nunc florentia longo postliminio in Italiam fuerint reducta. Digna certe cognitio, quae a nobis nunc illustranda Italia in medium adducatur."

With the exception of the section on southern Italy, the *Italia illustrata* of Biondo, begun in 1448, was completed by 1451, when it was presented to Alfonso of Aragon: Riccardo Fubini, "Biondo, Flavio," *DBI* 10 (1969), 550.

> other way than Petrarch did, nor did he write anything that we know of.[7]

As Biondo constructed the early development of humanism, although Petrarch had been instrumental in the recovery of Cicero's letters and oratorical writings, which were to serve as models for the new eloquence, he did not yet know all of Cicero's most important works or have access to a complete manuscript of Quintilian. Nor had Malpaghini, Petrarch's young assistant, been in a better position. Nonetheless, while Malpaghini himself had lacked the ability to re-create Ciceronian style, his desire to imitate Cicero had been realized by his own students, who comprised a majority of the great humanists of the early fifteenth century.

Biondo again relied on Bruni to explain how Malpaghini had exercised his influence: Giovanni of Ravenna

> ... by his own talent and by a certain divine gift, as Leonardo was accustomed to say, inflamed him [Bruni] and Pierpaolo Vergerio, Ognibene Scola of Padua; the Florentines, Roberto Rossi and Jacopo Angeli, and Poggio; Guarino of Verona; Vittorino da Feltre; and other students who made less of a contribution, with the love of good literature, as he said, and for the imitation of Cicero. He did this even though he could not teach adequately what he did not fully understand.[8]

Further down, Biondo, obviously again on Bruni's authority, re-emphasized that among Giovanni da Ravenna's earliest students were Guarino and Vittorino, who, the first teaching at Mantua and the second at Venice, Verona, Florence, and Ferrara, "educated an

---

[7] *In Italiam illustratam*, fols. 88v–89: "Primus vero omnium Franciscus Petrarcha, magno vir ingenio maioreque diligentia, et poesim et eloquentiam excitare coepit, nec tamen eum [is] attigit Ciceronianae eloquentiae florem, quo multos in hoc saeculo videmus ornatos, in quo quidem nos librorum magisquam ingenii carentiam defectumque culpamus. Ipse enim et si epistolas Ciceronis Lentulo inscriptas Vercellis reperisse gloriatus est, tres Ciceronis De oratore et Institutionum oratoriarum Quintiliani libros non nisi laceros mutilatosque vidit, ad cuiusque notitiam Oratoris maioris et Bruti De oratoribus claris, item Ciceronis libri nullatenus pervenerunt. Iohannes autem Ravennas Petrarcham senem puer novit, nec dictos aliter quam Petrarcha vidit libros, neque aliquid quod sciamus a se scriptum, reliquit."

[8] *In Italiam illustratam*, fol. 89: "suopte ingenio et quodam Dei munere, sicut fuit solitus dicere Leonardus, eum [se] Petrumpaulumque vergerium, Omnebonum scola patavinum, Robertum Rossum et Iacobum angeli filium florentinos, Poggiumque, Guarinum Veronensem, Victorinum Feltrensem ac alios, qui minus profecerunt auditores suos, si non satis quod plene nesciebat docere potuit, in bonarum ut dicebat litterarum amorem Ciceronisque imitationem inflammabat...."

almost infinite multitude and among these were the princes of Ferrara and Mantua."[9]

As Biondo described it, two men deserved credit for what he regarded as an abrupt revival of eloquence around 1400: Malpaghini and the Greek émigré, Chrysoloras. Most of Malpaghini's students, Biondo wrote, went on to study with Chrysoloras. Endeavoring to explain the same revival, however, both Poggio and Guarino, ignoring Malpaghini, praised Chrysoloras alone as the pioneer.[10] It would not have been easy to exalt a teacher like Malpaghini, who was unable to practice the style he taught and who wrote practically nothing. For Poggio, the study of Greek by itself awoke its students to "the great light of learning" and led to the reform of Latin letters, which before had been "silent, maimed, and weak."[11] According to

[9] *In Italiam illustratam*, fol. 89v: "Ex his autem quos Ioanni nostro Ravennati diximus fuisse discipulos duo etate priores, Guarinus et Victorinus hic Mantuae, ille Venetiis, Veronae, Florentiae et demum Ferrariae infinitam pene turbam et in his Ferrarienses Mantuanosque principes erudierunt." This passage probably served as the source for the later remark of Marcantonio Sabellico (1436–1506/08), *De Latinae linguae reparatione dialogus*, in *Opera omnia*, 4 vols. (Basel, 1560), 3:326–27: "adeo ut nihil dubitare possis verissima esse, quae de amborum [Guarini et Victorini] institutione vulgo feruntur: utrunque ab ineunte adolescentia nescio quo Ravennate, viro integerrimo dicendi magistro usum, siquidem haud parvi refert, qualem a teneris quisque annis fit praeceptorem sortitus. Ut mores igitur, ita studia pene paria; par etiam et aetas, vicinis inter se, propinquisque urbibus nati, propinquioribus professi: Feltri hic, ille Veronae genitus; hic Mantuae docuit, ille Ferrariae: uterque suo principi charus, sua felix uterque familia, felix vitae exitus. Alterius tamen fama aliquanto maior, quanto videlicet Feltro maior est Veronae." Cf. Remigio Sabbadini, "Vittorino da Feltre studente padovano," *Rivista pedagogica* 21 (1928): 629. Sabellico's phrase "ab ineunte adolescentia" appears to be a lapsus based on Biondo's statement that the two were among the earliest students of Giovanni da Ravenna.

[10] Immediately after the passage cited in n. 8, Biondo establishes the link between Chrysoloras and Malpaghini: "Interea Emanuel Chrisolora Constantinopolitanus vir doctrina et omni virtute excellentissimus quom se in Italiam contulisset partim Venetiis, partim Florentiae, partim in curia, quam secutus est Romana, praedictos pene omnes Ioannis Ravennatis auditores literas docuit graecas: effecitque eius doctrina paucis tamen continuata annis, ut qui graecas nescirent literas latinis viderentur indoctiores ...."

[11] Writing to Guarino, Poggio claims: "Utilitas preterea quam latinis litteris attulit, que ante suum adventum mute, mance, debiles videbantur. Excitata sunt eius opere ingenia ad grecarum litterarum studia, que magnum doctrine lumen nostro seculo attulerunt. Tum ad eloquentiam commoti sunt permulti, in qua pristinum fere dicendi ornatum recuperatum videmus": *Epistola*, VII, 18, in Poggio Bracciolini, *Lettere: 1. Lettere a Niccolò Niccoli; 2–3. Epistolarum familiarium libri*, ed. H. Harth, 3 vols. (Florence, 1984–87), 3:348.

Guarino, the Greek scholar restored the dignity of the Latin language.[12] Later in the fifteenth century, Paolo Cortesi offered a similar appraisal.[13] From our distance, it is difficult to say more about Chrysoloras's influence on Latin letters than that he must have inspired a young generation of scholars to seek excellence in their studies and writing, which would have meant striving to take seriously the Ciceronian prose style that they had studied in Malpaghini's classroom.[14]

[12] *Epistolario di Guarino veronese*, ed. Remigio Sabbadini, 3 vols. (Venice, 1915–19), 1:69–70.

[13] Cortesi, *De hominibus doctis*, 16: "Nam posteaquam maximarum artium studia tamdiu in sordibus aegra desertaque iacuerunt, satis constat Chrysoloram Byzantium transmarinam illam disciplinam in Italiam advexisse, quo doctore adhibito primum nostri homines totius exercitationis atque artis ignari, cognitis Graecis litteris, vehementer sese ad eloquentiae studia excitaverunt. Et quoniam sublato usu forensi illa dicendi laude carebant, incredibile eorum studium fuit in scribendis vertendisque ex Graecis in Latinum sermonem historiis. Sed cum historia munus sit unum vel maximum oratorium, attingenda ea erunt quae in unoquoque potissimum laudanda iudicabiumus."

[14] The effort of Christine Smith, *Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence 1400–1470* (New York and Oxford, 1992), 133–49, to determine the nature of Chrysoloras's influence more specifically is questionable. She seems to me correct in arguing (136) that Chrysoloras encouraged the use of architectural description in composing *laudes urbis* (136). Her argument is soundly based on an analysis of Chrysoloras's own *Comparison of Old and New Rome*, written in 1411. Chrysoloras may well have suggested that Bruni read Aelius Aristides, the ancient Greek author on whose work the Florentine humanist drew heavily for his *Laudatio florentinae urbis*. Unconvincing, however, is her main point that Chrysoloras sparked Italian creativity by teaching Italians to decompartmentalize knowledge (137). Prof. Smith's only solid evidence for this position is that contemporary Byzantine education focused on the relationships between disciplines rather than the differences. Consequently, Chrysoloras's approach fostered "the cultivated generalist, or *uomo universale* as he came to be called, rather than the narrow specialist or professional." I find no citation, however, either from Chrysoloras's works or from any of his Italian students, to support this conclusion.

Furthermore, we must qualify Michael Baxandall's remarks in *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350–1450* (Oxford, 1971), 78–91, crediting Chrysoloras with having transmitted from Byzantium to his Italian students an awareness of the importance of *ekphrasis* as a rhetorical technique and having shaped the way Italians spoke about painting and scuplture. While Baxandall is no doubt correct to maintain that Chrysoloras's influence and Byzantine influence generally affected the manner in which Italians spoke about art, the use of *ekphrasis* in oratorical compositions in Italy predated the arrival of Chrysoloras by more than thirty years. Smith, *Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism*, 140, seems to agree with Baxandall when she writes that before Chrysoloras, Westerners "knew the definition of ekphrasis without seeing how to apply it and without knowing the general principles governing panegyrical style."

To speak now only of Latin eloquence: What set Bruni's generation apart from the one that preceded it was the abandonment of the stylistic eclecticism championed by Petrarch. In its place, Cicero's orations and letters became the dominant models for Latin prose composition. Ciceronianism as it would be understood by the late fifteenth century remained far off: no challenge was yet posed to Cicero by a new, more informed eclecticism or by humanists favoring other ancient authors as dominant models.[15] Whereas humanists early in the fifteenth century still assumed that Petrarch had been right to enjoin each one to find his own style, they directed each neophyte writer to do so by approximating the Ciceronian model in his own work in his own way. Rigid Ciceronianism only became possible late in the century because early in the century humanists had grappled with ancient texts, gradually piecing together an understanding of how individual ancient authors used style, syntax, and vocabulary.

It is fair to say that the early-fifteenth-century Ciceronianism served to generate its own competition, in that the lessons learned in establishing the elements of Ciceronian style engendered stylistic analyses of other ancient Latin authors. Within decades, what had hitherto been tagged, in large part superficially, as "Apulian" or "Senecan" style or the like emerged as elaborated models, available for imitation in their entirety or in combination with one another. The process of definition resulted in a sharpening of notions of *vetustas* and facilitated humanists' pursuit of that ideal.

Of all the humanists in his generation, Bruni, praised even by Erasmus as a master of Ciceronian expression and clarity, came closest to the Ciceronian model, even though Bruni himself did not admit to imitating any one author.[16] Others outspokenly embraced

[15] See the discussion of competing conceptions of imitation in G.W. Pigman III, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980): 1–32.

[16] Erasmus, *Ciceronianus*, ed. Pierre Ménard, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1.2 (Amsterdam, 1971), 662: (Bulephorus): "Leonardus Aretinus mihi videtur alter Cicero." Bulephorus's interlocutor Nosoponus, however, qualifies the comparison somewhat: "Facilitate dictionis ac perspecuitate satis accedi ad Ciceronem, sed nervis aliisque virtutibus aliquot destituitur. Alicui vix tuetur Romani sermonis castimoniam, alioqui vir doctus juxta ac probus." While Boccaccio and Petrarch receive mention in Erasmus's extended description of Ciceronians, they appear only to be dismissed. Bruni is the earliest Italian humanist to receive praise as an imitator of Cicero.

In discussing how to develop an eloquent style in his essay *De studiis et literis*, dedicated to Battista Malatesta, written between 1422 and 1427, Bruni praises Cicero: "quem virum, deus immortalis? quanta facundia? quanta copia? quam

Cicero as their stylistic guide. Poggio, for instance, specifically designated Cicero as the source of his own style:

> Whatever talent there is in me, I recognize that it all comes from Cicero, from whom I chose to learn eloquence.[17]

Similarly, Guarino, in outlining how he instructed a new student, revealed the stylistic standards by which he taught:

> You will also take care that the boy brings with him the letters of Cicero; for I have decided that with me as his guide, or certainly as his companion, he will imbibe this style of Cicero, with which I will nourish him as with certain foods made of milk.[18]

As the teacher of most of the leaders of fifth-generation Italian humanism and the individual credited by Bruni as inspiring in them the passion for Cicero's style, Giovanni Malpaghini deserves to be acknowledged as the architect of what Biondo, Cortese, and Platina considered the rebirth of eloquence.[19] Malpaghini's name, however,

---

perfectum in litteris? quam in omni genere laudis singularem?": Hans Baron, *Leonardo Bruni Aretino: Humanistisch–philosophische Schriften mit einer Chronologie seiner Werke und Briefe* (Wiesbaden, 1928), 8. After Cicero, Bruni ranks Livy and Sallust as the finest prose writers, but he does not claim to limit himself to imitating any author.

[17] Poggio, *Epist.*, VII, 16; in *Lettere*, 3:345: "Quicquid tamen in me est, hoc totum acceptum refero Ciceroni, quem elegi ad eloquentiam docendam." Despite Poggio's claim, his style was idiosyncratic: Remigio Sabbadini, *Storia del ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della Rinascenza* (Turin, 1885): 19–25. F. Tateo, "La raccolta delle *Facezie* e lo stile 'comico' di Poggio," in *Poggio Bracciolini, 1380–1980: Nel VI centenario della morte*, ed. R. Fubini et al. (Florence, 1982): 221, considers Poggio's style in the *Facezie* "eclectic."

[18] Guarino, *Epistolario*, 1:367: "Curabis quoque ut puer ipse Ciceronis Epistulas secum habeat; decrevi enim ut duce me aut certe comite hunc Ciceronis stilum imbibat, quem illi ut quaedam lactis alimenta instillabo." Platina tells us of Vittorino's attitude toward Cicero (*De vita Victorini feltrensis*, 686): "A Cicerone ut ab uberrimo et gratissimo fonte numquam discedendum dicebat, quia sitim omnem tolleret in quovis genere dicendi nec satietatem pararet, sed desiderium quoddam iterum instandi ac legendi eius studiosis concitaret." Barzizza writes: "Orationes ipsae Ciceronis ... nos melius admonent quam ulla dicendi praeceptio aut ars a maioribus tradita": *Gasparini Barzizii bergomatis e Guiniforti filii opera*, ed. Giuseppe A. Furietti, 2 pts. in 1 vol. (Rome, 1723), 1:14.

[19] Of the six men mentioned by Platina as leaders among the humanists, only Barzizza and Filelfo did not study with Malpaghini. Filelfo, however, belonged to Biondo's generation and Barzizza's earliest surviving writings appear in 1407, when the new trend was already underway: R.G.G. Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza with Special Reference to his Place in Paduan Humanism* (London, 1979), 25.

has received scant attention from scholars, for three reasons. First, he was above all a teacher; he wrote little, and, apart from a brief letter lamenting Petrarch's death soon after it occurred, none of his works survives. Second, Malpaghini's inspiration remained unheralded by his students, who, because he had been unable to teach them how to attain the standard of diction that he set for them, considered themselves largely self-taught. Finally, to the injury of his memory, historians have conflated Malpaghini, "Giovanni of Ravenna," with the other, prolific "Giovanni of Ravenna," Giovanni Conversini, leading them to overlook Malpaghini's role.[20]

Born at Ravenna about 1346, Malpaghini first appears in 1363 in Venice as a student of Donato degli Albanzani, who moved to that city to teach in 1357.[21] Taken into Petrarch's household as one of his amanuenses in 1364, Giovanni, quickly impressing the elderly scholar with the quality of his mind and the beauty of his calligraphy, became something approaching the son Petrarch's own Giovanni was not. Proud of his talents and eager for independence from what must have been the oppressive tutelage of the great man, Malpaghini, after a failed first attempt in 1367, finally succeeded in leaving Petrarch in 1368.

Malpaghini found employment in Rome with Francesco Bruni in the newly returned papal curia, where he and Salutati doubtless met.[22] When in the summer of 1370 the curia returned to Avignon,

[20] The best biographical sketch of Conversino is by B. Kohl, "Conversini (Conversano, Conversino), Giovanni (Giovanni da Ravenna), *DBI* 28 (Rome, 1983), 574–78. The bibliography of Conversino is found in B. Kohl, "The Works of Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna: A Catalogue of Manuscripts and Editions," *Traditio* 31 (1975): 349–67. For Remigio Sabbadini's assumption that Vergerio, Vittorino, Guarino, and Omnebono Scola were students of Conversini rather than Malpaghini, together with my refutation of that assumption, see my "Still the Matter of the Two Giovannis," 186–87. In any case, it is difficult for me to accept the position that a young man like Vergerio, whose first works reflected a passionate interest in oration, could have been trained by Conversini, who never displayed any concern with that genre of writing.

[21] Remigio Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna insigne figura d'umanista (1343–1408)* (Como, 1924), 241–49, provides a detailed sketch of Malpaghini's life. This must be supplemented, however, with Arnaldo Foresti, "Giovanni da Ravenna e il Petrarca," in his *Aneddoti della vita di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. A.T. Benvenuti, 2nd ed. (Padua, 1977), 485–513. The study was originally published in *Commentari dell'Ateneo di Brescia per l'anno 1923* (Brescia, 1924), 165–201.

[22] Salutati worked in Bruni's division of the papal chancery at least from April 1369 until the papal curia returned to Avignon the following year (Witt, *Hercules*, 82–93). On the career of Francesco Bruni, see ibid., 79, n. 5.

Malpaghini, unlike Salutati, followed, and he appears to have remained in Provence at least until 1372. An exchange of letters with Salutati following the death of Petrarch in July 1374, however, indicates that Malpaghini had by then returned to Italy. Details in Salutati's two letters to Malpaghini at this time suggest that by this date Malpaghini was probably residing in some city between Florence and Padua, perhaps Bologna.[23] Wherever he was, Malpaghini was likely teaching school. It is as a schoolteacher that he appears in Florence, where documents of the Florentine *studio* testify to his being professor of rhetoric from 1394 to 1400.[24]

Due to the fragmentary nature of the documents, it is difficult to determine whether Malpaghini had earlier appointments in the *studio*.[25] From Salutati's correspondence, we can be reasonably certain

[23] In a letter of July 25 (Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:167), Salutati refused to accept Malpaghini's invitation to flee the plague in Florence by coming to stay with him. Because we are told that many Florentines had sought refuge in the same place, it seems likely that Malpaghini's residence was in a city not far distant. Given Malpaghini's profession, either Bologna or Padua would be likely places, but the concluding lines of Salutati's letter of March 24, 1375, commenting on Malpaghini's intention to go to Padua after Easter, rules out Padua: ibid., 1:201. Foresti, "Giovanni da Ravenna," 505–08, convincingly establishes that these two letters of Salutati (Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:167–72 and 198–201) were sent to Malpaghini and not to Benvenuto da Imola, as Novati would have it.

[24] Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna*, 246, shows Malpaghini teaching in the *studio* for the scholastic years 1394–96 and 1397–1400. Enrico Spagnesi documents Malpaghini's teaching in the *studio* in 1396–97: *Utiliter edoceri: Atti inediti degli ufficiali dello Studio fiorentino* (Milan, 1979), 10. For references to his appointments, see ibid., 172, 174, 201, 217, 223, 240, 259, 260, and 265.

[25] Katharine Park, "The Readers at the Florentine Studio According to Communal Fiscal Records (1357–1380, 1413–1446)," *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 20 (1980): 264, has reconstructed the roster of professors for these years on the basis of communal fiscal records. For the 1388–89 list of professors, see R. Abbondanza, "Gli atti degli Ufficiali dello Studio fiorentino, dal maggio al settembre 1388," *Archivio storico italiano* 117 (1959): 85–110. For that of 1391–93, see Spagnesi, *Utiliter edoceri*, 102–68.

Abbondanza's roster of professors for 1388–89, presumably giving us "un quadro esauriente degli insegnamenti impartiti nello Studio" ("Gli atti," 84), nonetheless makes no mention of Domenico Bandini's chair in grammar, to which he had been appointed for ten years in 1382: on Bandini's first decade of teaching, see A.T. Hankey, "Domenico di Bandini of Arezzo (1335–1418?)," *Italian Studies* 12 (1957): 119. For Bandini's later appointments, see Spagnesi, *Utiliter edoceri*, 57, 152, 153, 182, 185, 195, 204, 219, 222, 231, 241, 248, and 263. Because in the school year 1395–96 Bandini continued to be identified as teaching both rhetoric and grammar (241 and 263), we may assume that the reference to him teaching rhetoric "in scolis suis gramatice" (231) or as elected "ad docendum Gramaticham" (248) in 1395–96 reflects scribal imprecisions. The case of Bandini suggests that the absence of Malpaghini's name from the official records of those paid to teach by the commune before 1394 does not necessarily foreclose the possibility that he taught in the *studio*.

that from about 1390 to 1394, Malpaghini was not teaching in the *studio* and that for some time in this interval, probably in 1390 or 1391, he lived outside Florence. His loss of a prior *studio* appointment may have been the source of his anger at Salutati in the early 1390s.

In any case, poor and with a family to support, even when not teaching in the *studio*, he would have had to teach rhetoric in a private capacity. That is what Cino Rinuccini did at Santa Maria in Campo in the mid-1380s.[26] Whether teaching publicly or privately, Malpaghini had lived and taught in Florence for many years before August 1401, when the *Signoria*, expressly because of his many years' teaching rhetoric, the major authors, and Dante in the city, allowed him to purchase property "just as if he were a Florentine citizen and from the city of Florence" (*prout si esset civis florentinus et de civitate Florentie*).[27]

What knowledge we have of Malpaghini's activities in the early 1390s derives from a letter of Salutati's designed to heal a rift between him and Malpaghini. We know from the letter, dated May 13 but without a year, that at an earlier point Malpaghini, a moody and difficult man, had come to believe that Salutati had done him an injury and for a long time (*diu*) had avoided contact.[28] He had even left Florence for an interval and lived in some unidentified, isolated place. Salutati's letter was provoked by Malpaghini's demand that Salutati return a manuscript that Salutati, after a good deal of effort finding a suitable amanuensis, was finally having copied. Salutati wrote that at the time Malpaghini was "perhaps older than forty-

[26] Giuliano Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini e la scuola di Santa Maria in Campo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 17 (1976): 625–74.

[27] *Statuti della Università e Studio fiorentino dell'anno MCCCLXXXVII*, ed. A. Gherardi (Florence, 1881), 374–75. Cf. Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:305. For mention of Malpaghini's family and economic circumstances see Gherardi, *Statuti*, 388 (1412).

[28] Salutati quotes Malpaghini's reference to his departure from Florence (Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:508–09): "Cum viderem in familiaritate nostra rationem omnem iocunditatis et benivolentie prime non consopitam modo, vitio nescio quo, sed prorsus expiravisse, contraxi, fateor, pedem meque in hanc solitudinem et habitationis et vite tanquam in arcem tutissimam contuli, putans immanitati fortune vim ipsam seviendi nullo pacto securius aut fortius subtrahi posse quam fuga civilium occupationum et populi vitatione." On the duration of the rupture, Salutati writes (ibid., 3:508): "Cogita parumper ... quod tam diu pedem a congressu linguamque a colloquiis ... debueris continere." Salutati only alludes to Malpaghini's complaint against him: "Unde presumis me officio defuisse? nunquid hactenus me vidisti tuorum honorum aut commodi non ferventissimum promotorem" (ibid., 3:510).

five," which in view of Malpaghini's birthdate of 1346 suggests that the letter was written about 1391/92.[29]

Salutati's effort to achieve an accommodation with Malpaghini obviously worked, because on June 10, apparently in the same year, Salutati wrote to express his happiness that his correspondent wanted to restore the previously close ties between them. He felt assured of Malpaghini's sincerity because, together with a letter, Malpaghini had sent a manuscript containing orations by an author whom Salutati did not identify.[30] Presumably, Malpaghini abandoned his self-imposed exile soon after Salutati wrote his letter and returned to Florence. By the fall of 1393, Salutati was trying to find a lucrative appointment for his friend at the court of the young Carlo Malatesta in Rimini. Informed of the death of Carlo's adviser, Jacopo degli Allegretti, Salutati hoped that the young Malatesta would appoint Malpaghini in his place.[31] The effort must have failed, because the following year Malpaghini was in Florence, ready to take up his teaching duties at the *studio.*

Malpaghini's relationship with the *studio* after 1401 is fairly well-documented. While we do not have proof of his reappointment for 1400–01, a period of plague when the *studio* was likely closed, a reference to his continued teaching in the *Signoria*'s privilege of August 1401 intimates that he had an appointment for 1401–02.[32] His appointment for 1402–03, therefore, authorized by the August 1401 privilege, would have been a renewal.[33]

---

[29] Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:510. While Novati dates this letter 1401?, both Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna*, 247, and Foresti, *Annecdoti*, 511, assign the first letter to 1392/93 and the second to 1391 on the basis of Salutati's statement. Salutati, who tended to be very accurate where age was concerned, appears not to have known Malpaghini's birthday exactly. For Salutati's concern with age, see my *Hercules*, 14, and passim.

[30] Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:520–23. Novati, consistent with his dating of the earlier one, assigns this letter to 1401.

[31] Aldo F. Masséra, "Jacopo Allegretti da Forlì," *Atti e memorie della reale Deputazione di storia patria per le provincie di Romagna*, 4th ser., 15 (Bologna, 1925–26): 189–93, convincingly dates Salutati's letter to this year, arguing against Novati's dating of 1401 (Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:534, n. 1).

[32] Theodor Klette, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur der italienischen Gelehrten-renaissance*, 3 vols. in 1 (Hildesheim and New York, 1970), 1:31, suggests that the fear of plague might have closed the *studio* in 1400–01. The privilege speaks of Malpaghini "moram trahentis ad presens et a pluribus annis citra in civitate Florentie, et legentis Rethoricam et Autores in Studio florentino" (Gherardi, *Statuti*, 375).

[33] Gherardi, *Statuti*, 377.

With the *studio* shut between 1407 and 1412, Malpaghini would have maintained himself and his family by private teaching.[34] He was evidently faring badly without his official salary, however, and in August 1412, by way of compensation, he was given a five-year contract with the *studio*, beginning in October, to teach rhetoric, the ancient authors, and Dante.[35] When that contract was about to expire, in April 1417, Malpaghini requested and received a five-year extension.[36]

He may have filled out the second term before his death. Although scholars have assumed that the appointment of Giovanni di Gherardo of Prato for 1417–18 indicates that Malpaghini died at the end of his first term, Giovanni di Gherardo's appointment was merely to teach Dante, and not rhetoric or the ancient authors. Moreover, Gherardo had taught the same material the previous school year, when Malpaghini was certainly alive.[37] Similarly, the appointment of Marco di Giovanni d'Arezzo to a chair of rhetoric in 1417–18 and again in 1418–19 and 1419–20 does not necessarily mean that Malpaghini was dead. Marco di Giovanni had already been teaching rhetoric in the *studio* in the two previous years alongside Malpaghini, in a subordinate position.[38] In sum, we have no reason to believe that Malpaghini died before finishing his second contract.[39]

What was the character of the Ciceronianism that Malpaghini preached but could not acquire himself? Biondo's stress on the essential role of the revival of Cicero's speeches and letters in the rise of humanism, joined in his account with Malpaghini's reported insistence on imitating Cicero, suggests that the genres of oratory and

[34] Park, "The Readers at the Florentine Studio," 268.

[35] Gherardi, *Statuti*, 388. His salary was also raised to ninety-six florins, in contrast with his salary of seventy in 1402–03. Malpaghini is cited in the document saying that he has chosen Florence "in patriam et perpetuam sedem suis filiis relinquendam."

[36] Ibid., 402.

[37] For the basis of 1417 as Malpaghini's date of death, see Klette, *Beiträge*, 1:33. For Giovanni di Gherardo's appointments, see Park, "The Readers at the Florentine Studio," 274–75.

[38] His salary of thirty florins was less than a third of Malpaghini's ninety-six (Park, "The Readers at the Florentine Studio," 274–74 and 277–78). In his last year, he received forty florins' salary.

[39] In her investigation of the communal financial records for 1413 and after, Park, ibid., seems to have found no trace of payments to Malpaghini.

letter writing, containing some of the most distinctive characteristics of Ciceronian style, furnished Malpaghini with his principal models for imitation. References to Ciceronian imitation by humanists of the next generation indicate that those genres continued to be the major ones used for instructional purposes.

2

Geri d'Arezzo had not needed Cicero's letters to inspire his pioneering efforts to reform the personal letter. While it is almost certain that his discovery of *Ad Atticum* in Verona in 1345 had led Petrarch to begin his own collection of correspondence, Petrarch's conception of the letter may already have been influenced by Geri's example. But if Petrarch's encounter with the familiar style of *Ad Atticum* was the principal cause for his break with *dictamen*, it was Seneca, nonetheless, who furnished the basic stylistic elements that Petrarch borrowed from antiquity. Almost fifty years later, when the content of the newly discovered *Ad familiares* made a deep impression on Salutati, the stylistic aspects of the letters had no discernible impact on the sexagenarian's own writing style.

The real engine of stylistic change in the Quattrocento was not Cicero's letters but his orations, a genre that held little interest for Trecento humanists. Important manuscript discoveries of oratorical material after 1350, such as Cicero's *Pro Quintio* and P*ro Flacco* and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, together with increased acquaintance with the known corpus through exchange of manuscripts, may have had something to do with the change.[40] But the emergence of oration on the leading edge of stylistic development had more to do with a new attitude toward oratorical composition.[41]

[40] See Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:164 and 211, for the discoveries. When Lapo Castiglionchio sent Petrarch a copy of the *Institutio*, he also sent four orations unknown to Petrarch and received in return the *pro Archia*, which he did not know (ibid., 2:168).

[41] Surveys of Italian eloquence in the Renaissance include Emilio Santini, *Firenze e i suoi oratori nel Quattrocento* (Milan, 1922), and Alfredo Galletti, *L'eloquenza (Dalle origini al XVI secolo)* (Milan, 1938, rpt. 1958). Carmela Ori, *L'eloquenza civile italiana nel secolo XVI* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1907), contains in the opening sections material on earlier periods. A new survey of the field is needed, particularly in light of John McManamon's *Pierpaolo Vergerio the Elder: The Humanist as Orator* (Binghamton, 1996), which shows that the revival of oratory began at the turn of the fifteenth century (see esp. 31–49), and the present study.

We have already spoken of Cicero's orations in chapter 5 in relation to Brunetto Latini's revival of Cicero's identification of oration with eloquence in the *De inventione*. Latini's vernacular translation of three of Cicero's orations testifies to his belief that citizens trained in Ciceronian oratory would not only grow in personal virtue but would become more devoted to the common good as well. Latini's emphasis on Cicero's writings, however, had no apparent repercussions for fourteenth-century vernacular writers. As for the fourteenth-century humanists, they believed that eloquence that fostered virtue could potentially be created in any genre of prose or poetry and, as a matter of practice, they rarely tried to find it in oratory.

To appreciate the change in the attitude toward oratorical rhetoric after 1400, however, more must be said about the status of oratory in previous centuries. First, it should be recalled that *ars dictaminis*, almost synonymous with rhetoric in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, had an oral orientation. Even if in fact letters were read aloud only when addressed to the council of a commune or the lord of a city, oral conceptions dominated the rules for letter writing of all kinds. We have seen in Salutati's case how effective it could be to put words in somebody else's mouth.

While on the whole stylistically independent of ancient oratorical models, manuals of *ars dictaminis* usually contained a few references to Cicero in their introductory pages, as if to invoke his authority in support of what was to follow. Indeed, the manuals' basic definitions of the *epistula*, *exordium*, and *narratio*, their teaching of *colores rhetorici*, and occasional scattered references were based on Cicero. But such a limited connection can hardly have justified the enduring concern of *dictatores* to study and teach the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium*: at least in the best schools, lessons in *ars dictaminis* were associated with lectures on the ancient manuals from at least the late twelfth century and probably from long before that.[42]

[42] For the formal link between *dictamen* and the Ciceronian texts in the thirteenth century, see John O. Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion, and Commentary*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, fasc. 58 (Turnhout, 1995), 174–79 and 293, n. 82. Martin Camargo provides an excellent survey of medieval treatises of *ars dictaminis* and a discussion of its methodology: *Ars dictaminis, ars dictandi*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, fasc. 60 (Turnhout, 1991). Even before the thirteenth century, in 1196, Boncompagno, professor of *dictamen* at Bologna, mentions a commentary that he has prepared on the *De inventione*, presumably for teaching purposes: Terence O. Tunberg, "What is Buoncompagno's 'Newest Rhetoric'?" *Traditio* 42 (1986): 332; and my "Boncompagno and the Defense of Rhetoric," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986): 17–18.

The explanation is simple: the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* were not primarily being used to teach letter writing and speechmaking. Instead, they were being used to fulfill two general educational functions. First, they were used to give students of *dictamen* a deeper appreciation of audience psychology and the vocabulary of rhetorical analysis. Second, they provided students who would be going on to study law and medicine with a bridge between the practical exercises of *dictamen* and the intellectual demands of the professional disciplines. Specifically, the Ciceronian texts played a vital role in the development of the students' capacity for reasoning.

One of the mysteries of medieval Italian education, the almost total absence of references to training in dialectic before 1250, can be explained partly by the central role that the *De inventione* and the *Ad Herennium* played in Italian classrooms. To the extent that Italian students learned logic before passing on to more specialized training, they usually learned it from Cicero. The ancient manuals, along with Cicero's immensely popular work on rhetorical topoi, *De topica*, served as the main texts for teaching law students to construct legal arguments.[43] The situation appears to have changed only late in the thirteenth century with the diffusion of Scholasticism in Italy: by the mid-fourteenth century, a student commonly studied a year of logic taught by a *dialecticus* before or after his training in *dictamen*.[44] For the earlier period, however, the oratorical manuals attributed to Cicero acted as textbooks for teaching logic.[45]

Although in theory both letters and speeches were read aloud, *ars*

[43] Proof of the importance of *De topica* will be found in my forthcoming *The Two Cultures of Medieval Italy, 800–1250*.

[44] In Bruni's *Ad Petrum Istrum Dialogus*, Salutati is made to emphasize his own intense study of the art of disputation as a youth in Bologna: *Prosatori*, 48–50. There is no reason to doubt that this information came from Salutati himself. In Conversini's account of his training a decade after Salutati, he refers to his study with a *dialecticus* in 1356 in Ferrara, when he was *immaturus*. In 1359, he studied *dictamen* and heard lectures on the *Ad Herennium* in Bologna. Cf. Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna*, 23–24.

[45] See the rich discussion of the general importance of the manuals in medieval education (Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric*, 270–97). I would minimize the importance of the manuals, however, in teaching courtroom oratory. The Italian method of validating one's argument by constant reference to Roman law, a method that later spread to northern Europe, posed an insurmountable obstacle to eloquent oratory in the courtroom. All of Ward's examples for judicial eloquence are taken from northern European sources before the domination of Roman law there (286). Nevertheless, Boncompagno must have designed his *Rhetorica novissima*, a manual on judicial rhetoric, to fill a need.

dictaminis was not specifically designed for writing speeches proper. By the early thirteenth century, a new kind of manual for speech writing appeared, the manual of *ars arengandi* or art of speaking. The appearance of *ars arengandi* coincided with the reinvigorated political life of the decades around 1200, generated by the breakdown of the aristocratic commune; the creation of the *podestà*, the commune's new executive official; and the tendency of the citizens' body of the commune to become larger. The large public meetings by which the communes of the thirteenth century conducted much of their business created a demand for training in public speaking, a demand that the new genre of manuals helped answer. Especially, the *podestà* was expected to give speeches before the assembly on a number of occasions during his term.

Assuming that their readers knew the theories of composition found in textbooks of *ars dictaminis*, the authors of speech manuals largely restricted themselves to providing series of model speeches covering the range of likely situations for speechmaking. Because both letter and speech composition figured in the program of the typical school of rhetoric, it was natural that the theoretical underpinning for speeches should be *dictamen*.

While *ars arengandi* relied heavily on *ars dictaminis*, borrowing the latter's stylistic constructions for its Latin models of oration, the newer art showed sensitivity to its particular audience, the lay society of the urban commune. The speeches contained in the earliest Latin manual, *Oculus pastoralis*, composed in the 1220s or 1230s, paralleled in their stylistic variety the model Latin letters of the period. Only a few years later, though, Guido Faba initiated a long tradition of vernacular *ars arengandi* by publishing a series of little treatises in Bolognese vernacular.[46] The increasing role of the vernacular in ora-

[46] Terence O. Tunberg has published the speeches from this work: *Speeches from the Oculus pastoralis*, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts, no. 19 (Toronto, 1990). On the classical references in the *Oculus pastoralis*, see the notes to Tunberg's edition of the work (Ph.D. diss., Toronto, 1986). On Faba, see *Arenge con uno studio sull'eloquenza d'arte civile e politica duecentesca*, ed. Giuseppe Vecchi (Bologna, 1954); and *Parlamenti e epistole*, ed. A. Gaudenzi, in his *I suoni, le forme e le parole dell'odierno dialetto della città di Bologna* (Bologna, 1889), 127–60. See also G. Vecchi, "Le *arenge* di Guido Faba e l'eloquenza d'arte civile e politica duecentesca," *Quadrivium* 4 (1960): 61–90. Cf. Alfredo Galetti, *L'eloquenza*, 462–66.

Although composed in Latin, Giovanni of Viterbo's *Liber de regimine civitatis*, ed. Gaetano Salvemini, in *Scripta anecdota glossatorum: Bibiotheca iuridica medii aevi*, ed. G. Palmerio et al., 3 vols. (Bologna, 1888–1901), 3:215–80, written before 1264, suggests

tion suggests that while the thirteenth-century schools of rhetoric generally taught *ars dictaminis* in Latin, in speech composition they were more flexible, offering composition training in vernacular as well.

Beginning with Faba, speeches in *ars arengandi*, whether in Latin or vernacular, relied on *stilus humilis*, the style normally recommended by *dictamen* for communal rhetoric. Syntactically simple, lexically limited, and organized according to set patterns introduced by formulae, speeches composed in *stilus humilis* would have been relatively easy to write and to understand when read aloud. Even the Latin-illiterate would have been able to catch something of the Latin discourse, if at some distance, given the proximity of thirteenth-century Latin to most Italian dialects.

The most influential vernacular manual in the *ars arengandi* tradition, the *Arringhe* of Matteo dei Libri (d. 1276), in Bolognese dialect, provides an idea of the range of speeches designed to meet the needs of the medieval orator.[47] While the greater number of the speeches

by its model Latin speeches that in fact speeches based on them would be given in vernacular. While the body of the models are in Latin, the exordium and conclusion are sometimes given in both vernacular and Latin, and vernacular words occur at points in the Latin text itself. As G. Folena writes, "*Parlamenti* podestarili di Giovanni da Viterbo," *Lingua nostra* 20 (1959): 101: "... la funzione del latino è qui insieme quella di modello e di traccia e falsariga del volgare." Cf. Galletti, *Eloquenza*, 470. On the *Liber* generally, see Gaetano Salvemini, "Il *Liber de regimine civitatum*," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 41 (1903): 284–303. See V. Franchini, *Saggio di ricerche su l'istituto del podestà* (Bologna, 1912), 244–45, for the date of the work being before 1264.

In his *Rhetorica novissima*, ed. A. Gaudenzi, in *Scripta anecdota glossatorum*, ed. G. Palmerio et al., 2:251–97, Boncompagno in 1235 provided a unique kind of manual, one offering instruction in judicial rhetoric. For a detailed discussion of the work, consult Tunberg, "What is Buoncompagno's *Newest Rhetoric*?" 299–334. Manuals of *ars arengandi* sometimes included appeals to public officials for justice (e.g., *Speeches from the Oculus pastoralis*, 48–49), but actual courtroom oratory has not survived for Italy and probably with good reason.

[47] The work is edited in Matteo dei Libri, *Le Arringhe*, ed. Eleanore Vincenti, Documenti di filologia, no. 17 (Milan and Naples, 1974). For details of Matteo's life, see Paul O. Kristeller, "Matteo de' Libri, Bolognese Notary of the Thirteenth Century, and his *Artes Dictaminis*," in *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, 3 vols., Fontes ambrosiani, nos. 25–27 (Milan, 1951), 2:283–85. Kristeller cites earlier editions of the work, 284, n. 9. He publishes portions of Matteo's other works, 289–319. See also Eleanore Vincenti, "Matteo dei Libri e l'oratoria publica e privata nel Duecento," *Archivio glottologico italiano* 54 (1969): 228–33.

At least two other manuals, the *Flore de parlare*, attributed to Giovanni da Vignano, and the *Dicerie* of Filippo Ceffi, are dependent on the *Arringhe*. While the former *dictator* made significant additions to Libri's text, the latter made it more practical by omitting the literary references and didactic material: *Le Arringhe*, xxix and cxxvii.

dealt with public affairs, such as embassies to other communes, debates in communal assemblies, and various duties of communal *podestà* and captains, other speeches ministered to the needs of families on occasions such as funerals or reconciliations with enemies. The models of short speeches were sprinkled with a wide range of literary references, probably drawn secondhand from a few sources.[48]

The opening years of the thirteenth century also witnessed the emergence of a second kind of speech manual, this one of foreign derivation. This second type, *ars predicandi* or art of preaching, was probably imported in response to a new emphasis on preaching by Pope Innocent III. Not part of the normal school program of rhetoric, training in *ars predicandi* belonged to the formal education given later to aspiring clerics.[49] Manuals of *ars predicandi* usually showed no

[48] Vincenti suggests that much of Matteo's array of learning is drawn from three sources, the Bible, Albertano, and the "*Raxone*," a work that she has been unable to identify: *Le Arringhe*, cx–cxxv. Fragments of two other thirteenth-century manuals of speeches are found in A. Medin, "Frammento di un antico manuale di Dicerie," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 23 (1894): 163–81; and A. Gaudenzi, *I suoni, le forme e le parole*, 168–72, with corrections: Cf. G. Bertoni, "Note e correzioni all'antico testo piemontese dei *Parlamenti ed Epistole*," *Romania* 39 (1910): 305–14, and B. Terracini, "Appunti sui *Parlamenti ed epistole* in antico dialetto piemontese," *Romania* 40 (1911): 431–39.

[49] R. Rusconi, *Predicazione e vita religiosa nella società italiana da Carlo Magno alla controriforma* (Turin, 1981), 22–23. James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), 314, attributes the first surviving manual to Alexander of Ashby, who wrote his *De modo praedicandi* around 1200. Murphy, 269–355, has the most complete discussion of the manuals and their contents known to me. There is little question that the form came into Italy through the French. Carlo Delcorno, *Giordano da Pisa e l'antica predicazione volgare* (Florence, 1975), is the fundamental book on vernacular preaching in Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. For fourteenth-century sermons, consult also Gianfranco Fioravanti, "Sermones in lode della filosofia e della logica a Bologna nella prima metà del XIV secolo," in *L'insegnamento della logica a Bologna nel XIV secolo*, ed. Dino Buzzetti, Maurizio Ferriani, and Andrea Tabarroni, *Studi e Memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna*, n.s., 8 (Bologna, 1992), 165–85; David D'Avray, *Death and the Prince: Memorial Preaching before 1350* (Oxford, 1994); and Daniel Lesnick, "Civic Preaching in the Early Renaissance: Giovanni Dominici's Florentine Sermons," in *Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento*, ed. T. Verdon and J. Henderson (Syracuse, 1990), 214–32. For the fifteenth century, see John O'Malley, *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine, and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, ca. 1450–1521* (Durham, N.C., 1979); John McManamon, *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1989); and Peter F. Howard, *Beyond the Written Word: Preaching and Theology in the Florence of Archbishop Antoninus (1427–1459)* (Florence, 1995), with its rich bibliography.

On Innocent III's role in the spread of preaching, see P.B. Roberts, *Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante: Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton* (Toronto, 1981), 2 and 42.

sign that sermons would be given in anything but Latin. As a matter of practice, however, sermons based on the *ars predicandi* were often delivered before a lay or mixed audience, and in such circumstances the preacher would likely have bowed to necessity and spoken in vernacular.

The manuals of *ars predicandi* prescribing the rules for organizing and delivering a sermon differed widely in their contents: some offered lists of themes, exempla, and other references to aid the preacher.[50] Most, however, mainly presented techniques for composing the sermon itself. The preacher took his beginning with a theme drawn from the Old or New Testament. This would form the subject of the sermon. After the first enunciation of the theme, a *protheme* (or exordium) was introduced, essentially a prayer of exhortation. In the early *artes predicandi*, the theme would then be repeated and developed by use of examples and authorities, followed by a conclusion and final formulas. In the course of the thirteenth century, the organization became more elaborate, with the exordium receiving its own commentary and the theme being broken down into divisions and subdivisions.[51] The influence of dialectic on the format increased.[52] Until the late thirteenth century, *ars predicandi* manuals identified by author were probably of French or other northern-European origin.[53] Into the fifteenth century, foreign manuals still enjoyed a wide diffusion in Italy and governed preaching style.[54]

---

[50] For lists of manuals, see the following: H. Caplan, *Mediaeval Ars Praedicandi* (Ithaca, 1954); and idem, *Mediaeval Artes Praedicandi: A Supplementary Handlist* (Ithaca, 1936); T.M. Charland, *Artes praedicandi: Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au Moyen Âge* (Paris and Ottawa, 1936), 21–106; H. Caplan and H.H. King, "Latin *Tractates* on Preaching: A Book-List," *Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949): 185–206; J.J. Murphy, *Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography* (Toronto, 1973), 71–81; M. Jennings, "Monks and the *Artes Praedicandi* in the time of Ranulph Higden," *Revue bénédictine* 86 (1976): 119–28; and S. Gallick, "*Artes Praedicandi*: Early Printed Editions," *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 477–89.

[51] Roberts, *Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante*, 77–79.

[52] Charland, *Artes praedicandi*, 9.

[53] Thomas of Pavia (fl. 1249–1256) (Charland, *Artes praedicandi*, 33) may constitute an exception to this generalization. On the basis of P.E. Longpré, "Les *distictiones* de Fr. Thomas de Pavia, O.F.M.," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 16 (1923): 14–20, Charland suggests that the tract on preaching ascribed to Pseudo-Bonaventura may be Thomas's.

[54] The following discussion concerns only secular oratory and the significant change in the source material for speeches after 1300. See O'Malley, *Praise and Blame*, esp. 51–76, and McManamon, *Funeral Oratory*, esp. 5–35, for the influence of the epideictic oration on preaching in the course of the fifteenth century. On the later

I suggested, consequently, that in most Italian schools of rhetoric in the thirteenth century, instruction was limited to study of manuals of *ars dictaminis* and *ars arengandi*, accompanied by assignments requiring students to imitate the models found in collections of exemplary letters, often found as appendices to the manuals themselves. To a more limited degree, but almost certainly in the competitive academic environments of Bologna and Padua, lessons using the manuals may have been paralleled by others based on the ancient handbooks of Ciceronian rhetoric. Study of the ancient handbooks served primarily for teaching argumentation, a skill essential to a professional *dictator* defending his employer's interests either in a speech or letter. Training in composing sermons was based on the *ars predicandi*, which was used for instruction in the *studi* belonging to the religious orders and perhaps in some cathedral schools.

It is important for the following discussion to observe that *ars arengandi* remained something of a stepchild to *ars dictaminis*. Medieval *dictatores* showed a preference for the letter over the speech.[55] This was especially true in diplomacy. The letter was prepared by an expert in the controlled conditions of the chancery and was delivered by a messenger. In the case of a Latin-literate public, a letter, after its initial reading, remained as a permanent record of the communication. Where the audience was Latin-illiterate, the Latin letter could be translated on arrival and, even when the original was read publicly, the translation could be read immediately after. Given this practice, a writer could pull out all the stops in trying to compose in elegant Latin, knowing that at the least his audience could understand his message in translation.

The tendency of the speech manuals to favor simply constructed Latin and even vernacular orations indicates a special problem connected with Latin speeches. The oration was confrontational; it demanded an immediate public response in kind and allowed for less control of the situation by both sides. Not only must the audience's literacy be considered, but also the qualifications of the speaker. Roman lawyers were generally favored as speakers for important embas-

---

exaggeration of Ciceronianism in preaching, see Kenneth Gouwens, "Ciceronianism and Collective Identity: Defining the Boundaries of the Roman Academy, 1525," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993): 173–95.

[55] *Introductiones dictandi by Transmundus*, ed. Ann Dalzell (Toronto, 1995), 60 and 166–67, furnishes evidence for this preference.

sies because of their knowledge of Latin, legal training, and prestige, but, since there was no courtroom oratory, their professional status did not guarantee that they were experienced speakers.

The task of the speaker could prove daunting. The speech could be written in advance but might have to be tailored to fit the situation at the moment of delivery. While the speaker for the host might prepare a general response in anticipation of the meeting, impromptu additions would have to be made in the immediate aftermath of the ambassador's speech or soon thereafter. Any prolongation of the exchange in Latin might be too much of a challenge for one or both parties. Communication by letter, consequently, usually offered less potential for embarrassment for all concerned.

Ars arengandi manuals are our source for most of the secular speeches surviving from the thirteenth century. The manuals' popularity was on the wane after 1300. To my knowledge, no new manuals appeared in Italy after the early decades of the fourteenth century. Instead, individual speeches or small sets of them began to appear, more ornate, extended, and syntactically complex than the sample speeches featured in manuals. While some of the stand-alone speeches were clearly fictitious, others were likely based on orations actually delivered. Among the latter were the texts of three speeches said to have been delivered by Cola di Rienzo's ambassadors to Florence in early July 1347 and a contemporary speech recorded in the pages of Giovanni Villani's *Chronica*.[56] Still other speeches actually delivered, show the hand of teachers who reworked them for classroom purposes.[57] The orations survived because of their value as models of imitation for students.

Preliminary study of surviving manuscript material suggests that secular speechmaking enjoyed particular importance in three centers

[56] See *Briefwechsel des Cola di Rienzo*, ed. Konrad Burdach and Paul Piur, Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation: Zur Erforschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung, no. 2.4 (Berlin, 1912), 5–15, for the speeches of Cola's ambassadors and the Florentine response. Giovanni Villani, *Cronica*, ed. F.G. Dragomanni, 4 vols. (Florence, 1844–45), 4:163–67; and *Nuova cronica*, ed. G. Porta, 3 vols. (Parma, 1990–91), 3:532–39, gives a vernacular translation of the Latin speech delivered by Tommaso Corsini before the King of Hungary in 1347, together with the king's response, made on his behalf by a cleric, Giovanni di Visprimiense. A second ambassadorial speech, congratulating John XXII on his election to the papacy in 1314 and attributed to Dino Compagni, is found in BLF, *Plut.* 40, 49, fols. 117–118v, and BLF, *Plut.* 42, 38, fols. 3–4. Like Corsini's speech, it is translated into Tuscan.

[57] See Castiglionchio's speeches (below). In the form given in the manuscript, they appear to have been used for teaching purposes.

in Trecento Italy: Angevin Naples in the first decades of the century; and Bologna and Florence after 1360. The proclivities for sermonizing of Robert, the Angevin monarch of Naples (d. 1343), help explain the isolated survival of a small early-fourteenth-century collection of speeches, mostly by Bartolomeo da Capua, lieutenant of the kingdom (d. 1328).[58] In the case of Bologna, while a number of individual orations survive, the principal collections, occasioned by academic functions, are linked with Giovanni Calderini (ca. 1300–1365).[59] Florentine secular speeches, by contrast, have different authors and are primarily political.[60]

We have no reason to think that secular speechmaking was restricted to these three geographical areas in the first two-thirds of the century.[61] The speeches we have were not saved because they were

[58] The Angevin collection of speeches and sermons from the early decades of the fourteenth century are found in BNN, VII, E.2, fols. 186–88, 190v–95v, and 196v–206 (the speech of a Genoese embassy is on 203v–04). On Bartolomeo of Capua, Lieutenant of the Kingdom, see I. Walter and M. Piccialuti, "Bartolomeo da Capua," *DBI* 6 (1964), 697–704. For a discussion and rich bibliography dealing with Robert's sermons, see D.N. Pryds, "The Politics of Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Naples: Robert d'Anjou (1309–1343) and His Sermons" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Wisconsin, 1994). See also D.L. D'Avray, *Death and the Prince*, which deals broadly with royal funeral sermons and particularly with the rich material relating to the Angevins of Naples.

[59] BNN, VII, E.2, also contains, interwoven with and following the Angevin collection, political speeches, many academic prolusions, and sermons of Bolognese origin, beginning on fol. 176v. Most of these items appear to have been written by Giovanni Calderini (ca. 1300–65). The fourteenth-century Bolognese collection ends on fol. 211. A. Miola, "Le scritture in volgare dei primi tre secoli della lingua ricercate nei codici della Biblioteca nazionale di Napoli," *Propugnatore* 13 (1880), 124–30, provides a general description of the Naples codex. See also description in Paul O. Kristeller, *Iter italicum*, 6 vols. (Leiden and New York, 1963–97), 1:422–23. BNN, VIII, AA. 6, fol. 29, begins a series of sermons and speeches apparently all connected with Bologna in the second half of the fourteenth century. Kristeller, *Iter italicum*, 1:424, describes the contents of this manuscript as well. The earliest dated speeches are from 1361 and 1362, beginning at fol. 30. Again, many of them seem to have been written by Giovanni Calderini. See also Giovanni Calderini's speeches in BMV, *Lat.*, III, cl. 79 (2293), fols. 101–70v (cited in H.J. Becker, "Calderini, Giovanni [Caldarino, de' Calderari, Giovanni]," *DBI* 16 [Rome, 1973], 608).

[60] BNF, Mag. VI, 134, contains a series of discourses, of which many were given before the pope and emperor in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. The earliest dated discourse is identified as having been given in the first year of the reign of Urban V, 1360/61 (fols. 1–2). The manuscript also offers a number of anonymous academic prolusions that may have been written before 1400 (fols. 18–20). They may be Bolognese. For other speeches, see BAV, *Vat. Lat.*, 4872, fols. 276–79v (Filippo Corsini, 1396).

[61] For example, I have found no speeches surviving by a Venetian before the early fifteenth century, yet Venice certainly had orators (see below, 458, n. 30).

expected to become historically important but because they could be used as models. That the number of surviving speeches increased noticeably after 1360 and that they were principally of Bolognese and Florentine origin suggests that a new interest in oratory was stirring in those two cities after that date. In the fifteenth century, such an interest would become widely shared throughout Italy.

As a rule, we have no way to judge from content whether an orator delivered a speech in Latin or vernacular. The language of speeches of *podestà* entering and leaving their posts probably depended on local custom.[62] Although *missive* sent between city-state governments were always in Latin, the opening speeches of the ambassadors who presented them were not necessarily so. By Italian tradition, though, diplomatic missions to the emperor, the papacy, and kings of France and Naples required an initial Latin address. The ritual was carried out even when it was acknowledged that the eminent recipient was Latin-illiterate. In 1396, for example, the French king, Charles VI, made no effort to hide his ignorance of Latin and relied on an interpreter to give a simultaneous French translation of a Florentine ambassador's words.[63] Once initial formalities had been accomplished, diplomatic dickering likely proceeded in vernacular. Even in early-sixteenth-century papal Rome, Erasmus observed that after the opening speeches, serious diplomatic business was conducted not in Latin or even in Italian but in French.[64]

Aside from collecting manuscripts of Ciceronian orations, neither Petrarch nor Salutati made a significant contribution to the genre of oratory. Although Petrarch's *Invective contra medicum* reflects the influence of Cicero's oratorical writings, especially the *Verrines*, he never

[62] The Florentines were perhaps more elaborate in the ceremonies with which they observed the reception of a new *podestà*, but see Poggio Bracciolini, *Facezie*, ed. M. Ciccuto (Milan, 1983), 124–26.

[63] *Cronica di Buonaccorso Pitti con annotazioni ristampata da Alberto Bacchi della Lega*, in *Collezione di opere inedite o rare*, vol. 93 (Bologna, 1905), 101–04.

[64] If we are to believe Erasmus, even in Italy probably only the initial speech was in Latin: Erasmus, *Ciceronianus*, 654: "Quis igitur superest usus, nisi forte in legationibus, quae Romae praesertim latine peraguntur, ex more magis quam ex animo, et magnificentiae causa potius quam utilitatis gratia. In his enim fere nihil agitur rei seriae, in laudibus eius ad quem mitteris, in testificatione benevolentiae illius a quo mitteris, et in locis quibusdam vulgaribus consumitur omnis orator .... Hic itaque praeter salutationis officium nihil agitur, quod est serium, privatim literis et Gallicis colloquiis per agitur."

appears to have prized the oration as a major vehicle for demonstrating with eloquence.[65] Petrarch specifically disclaimed any talent for public rhetoric. His six surviving speeches are all forms of *ars predicandi* style, beginning with quotations from the Bible and or a pagan author and using the rest of the discourse to explore its meaning.[66] In Salutati's case, two of his three surviving orations follow the sermon format, whereas the other draws on *ars dictaminis*.[67] All three orations lack the vibrancy of Salutati's official letters, suggesting that the chancellor had not worked as hard on them, as on his *missive*, which he considered more effective vehicles for his eloquence.

Lack of interest in oration is easy enough to explain. As Salutati remarked, of the three traditional kinds of oratorical eloquence, deliberative, judicial, and epideictic oratory, only epideictic oratory afforded moderns an opportunity for eloquent speech.[68] What Salutati apparently meant was that deliberative oratory was normally the province of the vernacular, while modern lawyers, obligated to pile up as many citations from Justinian as possible to support their case,

[65] On the history of invective, see P.G. Ricci, "La tradizione dell'invettiva tra il Medioevo e l'Umanesimo," *Lettere italiane* 26 (1974): 405–14; and Claudio Griggio, "Note sulla tradizione dell'invettiva dal Petrarca al Poliziano," in *Buffere e molli aurette: Polemiche letterarie dallo Stilnovo alla 'Voce,'* ed. M.G. Pensa (Milan, 1996): 37–51. On Petrarch's style of writing invective in particular, see C.H. Rawski, "Notes on the Rhetoric in Petrarch's *Invective contra medicum*," in *Francis Petrarch, Six Centuries Later: A Symposium*, ed. Aldo Scaglione (Chicago, 1975), 249–77; and Claudio Griggio, "Forme dell'invettiva in Petrarca," *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia patavina di scienze morali, lettere ed arti: Pt. 3. Memorie della classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti* 109 (1996–97): 375–92. For a superlative analysis of Petrarch's use of the invective, see Carol Quillen, *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine, and the Language of Humanism* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 148–81. Petrarch conceived of his invectives being read, not spoken. He frequently referred to his *lector* (Griggio, "Forme dell'invettiva," 382).

[66] For the six orations, see my "Medieval *Ars dictaminis* and the Beginnings of Humanism: A New Construction," *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982): 21, n. 51. For these orations, see also Paul O. Kristeller, "Petrarcas Stellung in der Geschichte der Gelehrsamkeit," in *Italien und die Romania in Humanismus und Renaissance: Festschrift für Erich Loos zum 70. Geburtstage*, ed. Enrico Straub and Klaus Hempfer (Wiesbaden, 1983), 102–21. For Godi's new edition of the *Collatio laureationis*, see above, 230, n. 1.

[67] They are discussed in my *Hercules*, 433.

[68] For two of Salutati's orations, see my *Hercules*, 433. On judicial oratory in his own day, Salutati commented (Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:341): "Vehementiam autem illam oratoriam, que in actione consistit, in qua plurimum valuisse Ciceronem credimus, quia civiles illas questiones que vim totam eloquentie deposcebant non ab oratoribus, sed a iuris civilis prudentibus viris sumptis ex legibus argumentis, nostro more tractantur, in aliquo nisi forsitan in predicatoribus hoc nostro tempore non requiras." See also Vergerio, below. A third oration of Salutati's is found in BAV, *Vat. Lat.*, 4872, fols. 281–84: cf. Kristeller, *Iter italicum*, 2:369.

could find no room for eloquence in the courtroom. But even when it came to epideictic oratory, Salutati showed no interest in classicizing speeches.

3

The earliest indication of a serious effort to introduce reform in oratory appears in the middle decades of the fourteenth century in the work of Florentine rhetoricians associated with humanistic studies in the city. Florence at midcentury boasted two orators, Luigi di Teri di Nello Gianfigliazzi (d. ca. 1375) and Lapo da Castiglionchio (d. ca. 1381), both professional jurists.[69] A letter of Salutati's to Gianfigliazzi in 1365 attributed to the Florentine lawyer an exceptional knowledge of antiquity, while Lapo, as a young man, a member of Petrarch's Florentine circle, received high praise from the master for his writing and learning skills.[70] Both men frequently served the republic as ambassadors, in which capacity they were expected to deliver Latin orations.[71]

Although a Roman lawyer, Gianfigliazzi composed a manual for teaching the Ciceronian handbooks of rhetoric and probably taught Latin rhetoric for periods of time in the Florentine city schools. His summary of the contents of the *De inventione* and the *Ad Herennium*, entitled *Summa dictaminum retorice ex arte veteri et nova collecta*, was designed as an overview of the two works as well as an aid for teaching them. He explained his method of presentation in his preface:

[69] The highly respected young *dictator* Bruno Casini died of plague in 1348, and apparently nothing of his work survives: F. Troncarelli, "Casini, Bruno," *DBI* 21 (Rome, 1978), 355–56.

[70] Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:9–12, wrote Gianfigliazzi regarding a problem in interpreting Valerius Maximus. Salutati concluded the letter by praising Gianfigliazzi "qui nedum nosti sacrarum legum illuminare caliginem et concordare discordiam, sed morum, nature et rationis secreta apiceque profunda mente vestigas." He sent him a second letter several months later, lamenting the death of the astrologer, Paolo Dagomari (ibid., 1:15–20). Lapo's biography is found in M. Palma, "Castiglionchio, Lapo da," *DBI* 22 (1979), 40–44. Lapo took up law studies about 1353 (42).

[71] For Gianfigliazzi's political career, see Francesco Novati, "Luigi Gianfigliazzi, giuresconsulto ed orator fiorentino del sec. XIV," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 3 (1889): 441–42. For Lapo, see Palma, "Castiglionchio," 41–42. Besides bibliography in Palma, see Lapo's unpublished letter to Francesco Bruni, BNF, *Magl.* VIII, 1439, fols. 3v–4.

> For first, I will summarize the rubrics of the chapters according to the order of the *New Rhetoric* [*Ad Herennium*] in each genre of discourse and add to them only what more is said in the *Old Rhetoric* [*De inventione*]. Then I will add to the individual rubrics in cases where Tully speaks in detail in the *Old* and the *New Rhetoric* about the sections briefly collected under them.[72]

After a short *accessus* (fols. 1v–3v), Gianfigliazzi, using the rubrics of the *Ad Herennium* as his guide, provided marginal notes indicating discrepancies between it and the *De inventione*. Nothing in Gianfigliazzi's work, however, indicates a new approach to the Ciceronian texts, and because no known copy of any of Gianfigliazzi's speeches exists, we have no way of assessing why contemporaries thought so highly of his oratorical talents.[73]

The same is not the case for Lapo, whose speech delivered before the pope in Avignon in the fall of 1366 survives in a form showing that it was used later for teaching purposes. We know that Lapo was interested in ancient literature: he is remembered for having brought Quintilian to Petrarch's attention by sending him a mutilated text of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, together with four Ciceronian orations new to Petrarch.[74] A Latin letter of Lapo's, found in the collection

[72] BAV, *Chig.*, J. VIII, 291, fol. 1: "Primo namque secundum quod retorica nova procedit in quolibet dicendi genere distinctionum membra summabo, id solum quod plus in veteri traditur illis addens. Deinde singulis rubricis apponam ubi de membris sub eis brevi[ter] collectis in veteri, vel in nova per Tullium late tractetur." Cf. Novati, "Luigi Gianfigliazzi," 446. The text is found in fols. 1–19, not 1–39 as Novati has it. Cf. Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric*, 66. Ward also notes, 66–67, a manuscript containing notes on the early part of the *De inventione*, belonging to the Florentine orator, Lorenzo Ridolfi: see examples of Ridolfi's speeches in BNF, *Magl.* VI, 134, fols. 10v–13v. For details of Ridolfi's career, see the index of Lauro Martines, *Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence* (Princeton, 1968), 526, with its many references.

[73] In his *Risponsiva alla invectiva di messer Antonio Luscho*, written early in the fifteenth century, Cino Rinuccini (d. 1417) singles out Gianfigliazzi for praise as one of Florence's illustrious citizens: "l'eloquentissimo uomo messer Luigi de' Gianfigliazzi, il quale molto per la nostra repubblica dinanzi al Padre Santissimo e al Serenissimo Cesare e a illustrissimi re orò docissimamente e che li ammaestramenti dell'arte vecchia e della nuova del facondissimo Cicerone concordò e brevemente notò": in Coluccio Salutati, *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum Vicentinum*, ed. D. Moreni (Florence, 1826), 234. On the dating of this work, see my *Hercules*, 388–39, n. 48.

[74] He sent an incomplete Quintilian to Petrarch, together with four Ciceronian orations, *Pro Milone*, *Pro Plancio*, *Pro Sulla*, and *De imperio Cn. Pompei*, in 1350: A. Foresti, "Le lettere a Lapo da Castiglionchio e il suo libro ciceroniano," in *Aneddoti della vita di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. A.T. Benvenuti (Padua, 1977), 242–50. For Lapo's philological interests see Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:168–73. For an unpublished letter of Lapo to Francesco Bruni, see BNF, *Magl.*, 1434, fols. 10v–11.

made by Francesco Bruni in Avignon about 1363 or 1364, shows the mature Lapo still interested in manuscripts of the pagan authors and struggling to master Petrarch's flexible approach to letter writing.[75]

By the 1360s, Lapo had long since committed himself to the legal profession and to Florentine politics. Of all the orations he delivered in a long career, however, only three appear to have survived.[76] All three are purported to have been delivered before Pope Urban V at Avignon in the fall of 1366 in anticipation of his embarkation for Rome the next spring. While the embassy surely took place, internal evidence suggests that the second and third speeches were not given by the ambassador. The second, a description of the origin and significance of the Guelf and Ghibelline parties, was probably a teaching exercise from the beginning, while the third is merely an amplification of parts of the first.[77] Nevertheless, the first laden with details about the contemporary political situation and Florence's contribution to facilitating the pope's return, was in all probability the only speech actually delivered by Lapo in Avignon.

On the one hand, both in their penchant for abstract nouns (*sanctitas vestra*, *aures magestatis vestre* [p. 234]) and set phrases (*orationis seriem aggrediar* [234], *ex causis predictis* [237], *prestare auditum* [238]), the speeches represent models of the *ars dictaminis* tradition.[78] Throughout the first and third orations, the frequent exclamations and interrogations, which convey intense emotion on the speaker's part, recall the letter writing tradition of *stilus rhetoricus*. The percentage of his use of standard *cursus*, however, is low enough to suggest that he was not

[75] In a letter written in 1389, eight years after Lapo's death, Salutati asks: "Quis Ciceronicarum rerum peritior? quis historiarum collectione fecundior? quis moralium praeceptorum imbutior? Deus bone, quanta dulcedine, quantaque soliditate sermonis, quanta demum promptitudine, cum dictaret et officio scriptionis incumberet, affluebat; quam splendida vocabula, seu propria, seu novata sibi, dum scriberet, suppetebant; quantus exundabat ornatus, quales quanteque sententie; denique quis totius orationis splendor, qualis varietas quantaque majestas!" (Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:218).

[76] These are published by R. Davidsohn, "Tre orazioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio, ambasciatore fiorentino a papa Urbano V e alla curia in Avignone," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 20 (1897): 225–46.

[77] Ibid., 238–39 and 240–46.

[78] The third speech opens in characteristic *dictamen* fashion with a display of abstract nouns: "Oblitus videor parvitatis mee sancte pater et non satis sanctitatis vestre magnanimitatem recognitasse. ...." (ibid., 240). Examples of set phrases, chosen by me at random, are "sub clipeo vestre protectionis suscipere" (234); "prestare auditum" (238); and the repeated use of forms of the participial adjective "predictus" throughout.

concerned with observing the rules, and his extended use of *ekphrasis*, the figure that moves listeners or readers by creating word pictures, is to my knowledge the first example since ancient times in surviving oratorical material.[79]

The most impressive example of the figure occurs in the third oration, in which Lapo envisages what the pope would behold on returning to Rome (144–45). Lapo describes the city's ancient and medieval monuments within the natural beauty of their surroundings and the effect that the papal return would have on Italy: *Videbitis ... videbitis ... audietis ... expergiscere ...* the procession of descriptions continues.[80] Lapo, a student of ancient oratory, probably learned the technique by studying the detailed instructions for *ekphrasis* in the *Ad Herennium*. His pioneering use of the device reflected a concern to follow the precepts of ancient oratory more closely than before. While Lapo employed *ekphrasis* here in a deliberative discourse, beginning with Vergerio the technique would become common coin in humanist epideictic orations, the genre with which it had been most closely associated in antiquity.[81] Given that an address before the pope was a specialized rhetorical occasion with its own linguistic codes, it is difficult to judge what Lapo's rhetoric would have been had he been speaking before, say, a communal audience instead. The collection of brief rhetorical exercises written and delivered by Cino Rinuccini and students of his school of rhetoric at Santa Maria in Campo twenty years later, however, were not composed for papal

[79] Of the 83 periods in the three letters (234–46), 53 per cent end in standard meters. McManamon, "Innovation in Humanist Rhetoric: The Oratory of Pier Paolo Vergerio the Elder," *Rinascimento*, n.s., 22 (1982): 12, is the first to show that from the early 1390s Vergerio employed *ekphrasis* in his orations. For an example, see ibid., 18. Also see McManamon's *Funeral Oratory*, 30–31, 78–79, and 134–35. Lapo, however, preceded Vergerio by a quarter of a century.

[80] The following is a passage from the extended *ekphrasis* ("Tre orazioni," 44–45): "Videbitis ubi nato Domino fons olei descendit in Tyberim, ubi templi pulcherrimi fondamenta ex ... nivis indicte jacta sunt, et ubi partu virginis templa fortissima corruerunt, cernentes lapidem ... Simonis cerebro maculatum; monstrabitur vobis Silvestri ... et ... Constantini et dictata celitus insanabilis morbi cura et innumerabilia, quorum alia, que animos vestros trahent ad supera, sed alia quidem plurima, qualia alia secula non viderunt, cernentes Romanorum principum stupenda licet collapsa palacia, Scipionum, Cesaris et Fabiorum domos, videbitis septem colles uno ambitu conclusos ...."

[81] Ernst R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York and Evanston, 1963), 69. Cf. *Ad Herennium*, III.6–8. Curtius, however, traces (193–94) spatial and temporal descriptions to the ancient courtroom, where they were used in arguments.

ears.[82] They were classroom exercises, mobilizing whatever rhetorical artistry the speaker could muster. The speeches by Rinuccini himself probably come close to representing the best of humanist efforts at composing speeches in Florence in the late fourteenth century.

Addressing the question of whether rhetoric benefits or harms society, all seven short pieces of epideictic oratory, three in praise of rhetoric and four in condemnation, are freighted with examples from ancient history, principally from canonical authors.[83] The debate itself may have been engendered by a statement in the *De oratore*, a relatively rare work still known only in fragmentary form at the time, that refers to the power of rhetoric to bend human minds to the speaker's will.[84] Explicit and tacit references to Petrarch's *Sine nomine* and *De remediis*, as well as to Dante's *Commedia*, alongside references to ancient authors, evince the esteem that the two writers enjoyed

[82] Cino Rinuccini, poet and publicist, has only recently been identified as a teacher of rhetoric: Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini." Rinuccini authored at least two Latin treatises, surviving in defective Italian versions, respectively entitled *Invettiva contra a cierti calunniatori di Dante e di messer Francesco Petrarca e di messer Giovanni Boccaccio*, in A. Lanza, *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Quattrocento: Storia e testi* (Rome, 1972), 261–67; and *Risponsiva alla invettiva di messer Antonio Lusco* (see n. 73, above). For discussions of aspects of Rinuccini's career in addition to the Tanturli article, see George Holmes, *The Florentine Enlightenment, 1400–1450* (London, 1969), 1–6; and my "Cino Rinuccini's *Risponsiva alla Invectiva di Messer Antonio Lusco*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 23 (1970): 133–49. For Rinuccini's business activity, see Lauro Martines, *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists (1390–1460)*, 110–12. Giovanni Cavalcanti, *Istorie fiorentine*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1838–1839), 2:464, refers to Rinuccini as a famous orator.

One of Rinuccini's students may have been Roberto Rossi (1355–1417), an intimate of Salutati's circle and a professional teacher of Greek in the early fifteenth century (Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini," 665–68). For Rossi's biography, see index of Martines, *The Social World*, 415. Rossi, about thirty at the time and a perpetual student, certainly worked with Malpaghini (see above, n. 6). We know nothing of the results of the second master's teaching.

We cannot be sure that Rossi was a student of Cino's. Rossi refers to his audience as "ingeniosissimi iuvenes equalesque dulcissimi" (Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini," 665), "industriosissimi fratres" (666), and "dilectissimi fratres" (668), but the other two speakers contributing to the collection, Lorenzo di Francesco (660) and Giovanni di Perugia (668), explicitly justify their speeches as commanded by the master, presumably Cino.

[83] The one possible exception being a reference to the Athenian constitution, which may have come from Gellius, *Noctes atticae*, II.12.1 (Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini," 665, n. 3).

[84] *De oratore*, I.8.30: "Neque vero mihi quicquam, inquit, praestabilius videtur, quam posse dicendo tenere hominum coetus, mentes allicere, voluntates impellere quo velit; unde autem velit, deducere": Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini," 645, n. 50.

among Florentine *literati* in the decades before their talents would be called into question by members of the fifth generation of humanists.[85]

A brief analysis of one of the two orations delivered by Cino Rinuccini himself provides a general impression of the character of humanist oratory by 1386. In his first speech, he defended rhetoric; in the second, he rebutted the first. In arguing that rhetoric was deleterious, he drew primarily on examples from Lucan and Homer: Curio convinced Caesar to cross the Rubicon and Caesar used his eloquence in turn to inspire his men to follow; Cicero urged on the forces of Pompey to battle; and Cato, his cause lost, persuaded his men to take their own lives along with him. In the case of Troy, the lying eloquence of Sinon deceived the Trojans into admitting the enemy, which led to their own destruction and that of their city.

The speech would have required less than ten minutes to deliver. It demonstrates great loyalty to the standard medieval *cursus*.[86] The choice of words is not always classical. For example, Cino persistently intensifies words by affixing *per* or *pre* (*periudicabant* [they judged severely], *permaximus* [the very greatest] three times, and *precarissime* [the very dearest]). In addition, as shown by the example below, he egregiously misuses the indicative in clauses of purpose and clauses of result.[87]

Nonetheless, the innovative character of Cino's prose cannot be denied: taking Ciceronian oration as his stylistic model, he attempted to re-create the Ciceronian period by using his verbs to organize the syntax into a sequence of clauses. The flow of the lines, however, was disrupted by his too-frequent use of parenthetical remarks, which he apparently considered necessary to heighten emotional expression. The novelty of Cino's effort is illustrated by the following passage, the case of Curio and Caesar, the first of the series designed to prove rhetoric's dangers:

> Nam in breviloquio narraturus a Curione initium summam, qui Caesarem, virum gravissimum sapientissimumque, suavi oratione ad horenda

[85] Cino himself was bitterly to defend the older view against the "classical humanists." Tanturli offers the most complete analysis of the conflict ("Cino Rinuccini," 625–58).

[86] Cino's two speeches (661–62 and 663–65) follow standard *cursus* in 76 per cent of the period endings, but there are only 29 periods in total.

[87] The oration's last period (665), however, uses subjunctive after *ne* in a series of purpose clauses.

> et infanda arma distorsit, et in tantum quod dictus Cesar sine temporis intervallo tam dulciter et blandiloque suis commilitonibus peroravit, ut (O scelerata materies!) arma nepharia contra dulcem patriam capesserunt et, aquilis mortiferis elevatis, Rubiconta, [qui] terminum tranquille pacis edicebat, ostiliter transnatarunt.[88]

The passage's classicizing aspirations are clear. The period is divided into seven clauses clearly marked off by six verbs (*summam*, *distorsit*, *peroravit*, *capesserunt*, *edicebat*, *transnatarunt*) and an apostrophe (*0 scelerata materies*). The principal clause occupies the first place in the period and is followed by a relative clause (*qui distorsit*), expanding into a result clause (*in tantum quod ... peroravit*), which in turn controls two subordinate relative clauses (*capesserunt* and *transnatarunt*).

Failures to classicize successfully include Cino's misuse of the indicative in *ut*-clauses of result and the use of *in tantum quod* to introduce another result clause. The adverb *blandiloque*, formed on the adjective *blandiloqium*, is unclassical. Cino nicely juxtaposes *ostiliter* with *tranquille pacis*, though, in the final clause.[89]

Malpaghini's achievement in teaching Ciceronian rhetoric with the texts of Cicero's orations themselves has to be interpreted, therefore, within the context of a more general effort by Florentine rhetoricians to introduce reforms in oratory: first, Gianfigliazzi's intensive study of the Ciceronian manuals; second, Lapo's introduction of Ciceronian *ekphrasis* into his own orations; and third, Cino's use of Cicero's orations themselves for teaching purposes. While in the long run Malpaghini was more influential because the students he taught turned out to be more important, it remains possible that he developed his methodology only after entering the Florentine milieu. In any case, by the late fourteenth century, Florentine humanists were

[88] Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini," 663. Derived from a single manuscript, one replete with difficult readings, the text required a significant degree of interpretive work on the part of the editor. In translation, the passage reads: "For, to narrate briefly, I will begin with Curio, who, with his sweet speech, turned Caesar, a man most serious and wise, toward using horrible and foul arms; and he was so successful in this effort that Caesar immediately addressed his fellow soldiers so flatteringly and enticingly that – O criminal line of reasoning – they took up nefarious arms against their sweet homeland and, with deadly eagles raised on high, hostilely swam across the Rubicon, which established the boundary of tranquil peace."

[89] Admiration for Cino's style grows when it is compared with that of Roberto Rossi (1355–1417), one of the first Florentines to learn Greek. His oration against rhetoric (Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini," 665–68) displays a fractured syntax and awkward use of oratorical effects. Lorenzo and Giovanni each give speeches for and against rhetoric, and the quality of their diction lies between that of Cino and Rossi.

ready to recognize and incorporate the ancient oratorical tradition, albeit tardily, into their educational curriculum.

4

The oratorical writings of the first of Malpaghini's students to publish his own works, Pierpaolo Vergerio, were consciously guided by Cicero's stress on clarity and flowing discourse. Echoing his master's teachings, Vergerio insisted on the important role that oratorical composition should play in the new learning and on Cicero as the model for both form and content. Although his own compositions testify to the difficulty of mastering the Ciceronian idiom, he was preaching the virtues of Ciceronian oratory.

It would fall to Leonardo Bruni to carry through the efforts of Cino and Malpaghini to attain a Ciceronian level of diction in oratory. More than a decade before, though, the young Vergerio (in 1391 he was about twenty-three) brought the new Ciceronianism out of the study and the classroom and into the public arena. In so doing, he bridged the gap between Trecento humanism, which had generally kept to the precincts of private life, and the world of politics and power. As a result, the humanist movement assumed greater relevance for a wider general audience, and within a few years it began to attract the sons of the urban elite to its educational program. Vergerio discarded some of the presuppositions of Petrarchan humanism, championing humanist rather than traditional rhetoric for the control of official or, more generally, public communication.[90] The oratorical style that Vergerio created, however, became outmoded once Ciceronian prose became the norm.

[90] In ch. 1, I briefly discussed the complex problem of deciding how to apply the terms "private" and "public" (see above, 10, n. 19). I wrote there that I consider "public" rhetoric to be primarily associated with oral presentation within institutional forums such as council halls and churches. Even though Trecento humanists intended to have their writings eventually communicated widely to others, they usually wrote with an individual recipient in mind. At the same time, although I defined the content of the communication as of secondary importance to whether or not a communication was private or public, it is fair to say that apart from a few works, such as Petrarch's *Sine nomine*, Trecento humanists generally did not deal with issues of politics or public policy in their classicizing writings. As a result, these issues were treated by traditional oratorical rhetoric.

The success of humanist oratory required more, to be sure, than the personal initiative of a few humanists. The success can be explained in part by the existence of a new audience, already generated by the movement. Until the late fourteenth century, humanism made converts primarily among members of the notariate and lawyers – particularly notaries – with a scattering of devotees among eminent patrician and princely families. By the 1390s, however, the urban upper classes were becoming intrigued by the new studies. Within the decade, as we shall see in chapter 10, patrician families in Florence began viewing humanist training as providing their children with credentials for political leadership, and the Venetian upper classes were not far behind their Florentine counterparts. Unfortunately, the chronology of humanism's spread in other places has yet to be documented, but the emergence of oratory as a key genre of humanist interest reflects both evolution within the movement itself and adaptation to the demands of new, less professionally oriented groups among its public. At a deeper level, at least in Florence, the admission of humanism to the public sphere coincided with a series of longterm developments in Florentine political life that no longer accorded with traditional communal conceptions of government. Ciceronianism would be put to use to articulate the new institutional political forms favorably and to justify their existence.

Born in Capodistria between 1368 and 1370, Vergerio lived in exile with his family at Cividale in Friuli between 1380 and 1382 before returning home. In 1385, he probably studied grammar briefly in Padua, before going to Florence in 1386 to teach dialectic.[91]

[91] A brief biography of Vergerio is found in the introduction to Vergerio, *Epist.*, xi–xxx. The basic biography of the humanist is John McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio the Elder: The Humanist as Orator* (Binghamton, 1996). Essential as well for understanding the work of Vergerio is McManamon's article, "Innovation in Early Humanist Rhetoric," 3–32. On Vergerio's early education, see McManamon's *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 14. For Vergerio's sojourn in Florence, see 11–13, 52, and 86–87.

While the following analysis shows my heavy debt to McManamon's excellent work, I differ with his interpretation of Vergerio's career in two major ways. First, whereas he considers Conversini to be Vergerio's mentor (*Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 64), I maintain that Malpaghini was. Vergerio had already written at least three orations before Conversini took up teaching duties in Padua in spring 1393, and Conversini's large corpus of writings, which includes no orations, does not suggest that he had any particular interest in oratory or in Cicero for that matter (ibid., 37). Besides, Conversini was a private teacher of grammar, not rhetoric, in 1393, a position that he probably gave up when he became Francesco Novello's chancellor later in the year (see my "Still the Matter of the Two Giovannis," 197).

Second, I differ from McManamon in insisting that, despite Vergerio's effort to

After two years of teaching and studying there, he went north to Bologna, where he studied physics and medicine for another two years and paid his way by teaching dialectic. Then, in 1390, abandoning teaching, he enrolled in law school at Padua.[92]

Bruni's identification of Vergerio as a student of Malpaghini's likely puts Vergerio in Malpaghini's classroom in 1386 and 1387, when Vergerio was also teaching dialectic. Vergerio returned to Florence on at least two other occasions, once in the summer of 1394 and then again for two years between 1398 and 1400 to study Greek with Chrysoloras; but the brief duration of the second visit and the focus of the third make it unlikely that he would have studied with Malpaghini on either of those occasions.[93]

The revival of the Florentine *studio*, effected in 1385 thanks to a large infusion of public money, initiated a wide search for eminent teachers, most of whom were acquired through raids on other *studi*.[94] The report of the new drive for formal education in Florence, a city that also boasted the presence of Salutati, acted as a magnet drawing students from distant places. Ambitious young scholars such as Vergerio and Antonio Loschi (1369–1441) were attracted to the city.

Despite his claim that he came to Florence expressly to study with Salutati, Loschi's contact with the busy chancellor would have been too episodic to justify his sojourn without the auxiliary attraction of classes to take in the burgeoning *studio*. Initially intending to remain for some time, the seventeen- or eighteen-year-old Loschi probably began classes at the university. Although not a student of Malpaghini's – Bruni would have mentioned him in the list of the teacher's famous students – Loschi's dedication to the orations of Cicero, ultimately resulting in his *Inquisitio artis in orationibus Ciceronis*, may have been inspired by the new Ciceronianism flourishing in the

revive classical oratory, his own Latin style fell short of realizing the goal. When McManamon writes, for example, that Vergerio's "dedication to humanist studies led him to recover the classical style of oratory" (McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 39) the difference between intention and accomplishment becomes confused. See also ibid., 80–82.

[92] Vergerio was enrolled as a teacher of logic in the Bolognese *studio* for the academic year 1388–89: U. Dallari, *I rotuli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio bolognese dal 1384 al 1799*, 4 vols. (Bologna, 1888–1924), 1:7. Cf. Hans Baron, "The Year of Leonardo Bruni's Birth and Methods for Determining the Ages of Humanists Born in the Trecento," *Speculum* 52 (1977): 602. Cf. also McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 17–29.

[93] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 91–93.

[94] On the revived *studio*, see above, 322.

city's schools of rhetoric. Loschi's stay appears to have lasted only a few months in 1387 and was cut short by the Visconti takeover of Vicenza, but the young scholar, charming and eloquent, managed to achieve a rare degree of intimacy with Salutati, which even Loschi's later partisanship for the Visconti did not destroy.[95] The young Vergerio, teaching dialectic and presumably studying rhetoric with Malpaghini from 1386 to 1388, likewise became friends with Salutati, with whom he would maintain a correspondence until the latter's death. Vergerio and Loschi must also have met.

The arrival in 1385 of a brilliant canon and civil lawyer from Bologna, Francesco Zabarella (1360–1417), was also probably connected with the dawning good fortune of the Florentine *studio*. Taking degrees in both Roman and canon law in Florence earlier in the year (obtaining degrees in Florence perhaps cost less than in Bologna), Zabarella began to teach canon law in the fall.[96] He was to remain a professor in the *studio* until 1391, when he returned to teach in his native Padua. Vergerio and Zabarella, who were to become fast friends, may have formed their bond initially in Florence.[97]

[95] Loschi was born in 1369: see Dieter Girgensohn, "Antonio Loschi und Baldasarre Cossa vor dem Pisaner Konzil von 1409 (mit der *Oratio pro unione ecclesiae*)," *IMU* 30 (1987): 8. This excellent article is the best summary of Loschi's life. In 1406 Vergerio writes that he was *adolescentulus* when he came to Florence and did not stay long: Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:477. Called home by the fall of Verona in October 1387, he wrote to Salutati on March 18, 1388. His stay in Florence may only have lasted a few months, but Loschi formed a friendship with Salutati that he would maintain through correspondence long after his departure. Loschi affirms that he came to Florence specifically to study with Salutati: V. Zaccaria, "Antonio Loschi e Coluccio Salutati (con quattro epistole inedite del Loschi)," *Atti del Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere, ed arti* 129 (1970–71): 346–48. For Loschi's verses of admiration sent to Salutati from Vicenza before arriving in Florence in 1386, see ibid., 366. On Loschi, see Zaccaria, "Le epistole e i carmi di Antonio Loschi durante il cancelleriato visconteo (con tredici inediti)," *Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Atti e Memorie*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, 8th ser., vol. 18, fasc. 5 (1975): 369–443; and the review article by Riccardo Fubini, *Rivista storica italiana* 88 (1976): 865–71. The basic outline for Loschi's life remains Giovanni da Schio, *Sulla vita e sugli scritti di Antonio Loschi vicentino, uomo di lettere e di stato: Commentarii* (Padua, 1858).

[96] For a brief biography of Zabarella, see Dieter Girgensohn, "Francesco Zabarella da Padova: Dottrina e attività politica di un professore di diritto durante il Grande Scisma d'occidente," *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 26–27 (1993–94): 1–48. Cf. Baron, "The Year of Leonardo Bruni's Birth," 599–604. On Zabarella in Florence in 1385, see Antonio Zardo, "Francesco Zabarella a Firenze," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 22 (1898): 3. Zabarella acted as vicar of the bishop while teaching canon law: Gherardi, *Statuti*, 350. For other biographical material on the cardinal, see Girgensohn, "Francesco Zabarella," 4–5.

[97] Girgensohn, 40–41, discusses Zabarella's interest in Petrarch. Like Vergerio, Zabarella wrote a brief response to Petrarch's *Rerum familiarium* XXIV.2 and 3:

Meanwhile, Vergerio, after years of apprenticeship, re-established himself in Padua in 1390 and decided to initiate his publishing career by breaking with Trecento humanism. Evidence of his decision lies in the fact that his first surviving work written at Padua, besides letters, consists of orations. Beginning in 1391, he presented a series of annual orations in honor of Saint Jerome's feast day, while between 1390 and 1392 Vergerio wrote a judicial oration, ostensibly delivered before Francesco Novello da Carrara in defense of the accused traitor Bartolomeo Cermisone.[98] In 1392, Vergerio wrote an oration publicly celebrating the first anniversary of Francesco Novello's reacquisition of Padua from the Visconti, and in 1393 he composed a funeral speech for Francesco il Vecchio, who had died in a Visconti prison five years earlier.[99]

In accordance with Cicero's *De inventione* and the pseudo-Ciceronian *Ad Herennium*, Vergerio structured his orations according to whether they were epideictic or judicial. Independent of *dictamen* and *ars predicandi*, Vergerio's first works constitute the earliest public presentation of humanist oratory. In contrast with the rhetorical exercises of Cino's classroom, these are not pretentiously learned little set pieces but compositions designed to serve specific political and religious purposes.[100]

Malpaghini's influence emerges not only in that Vergerio's orations show Cicero's influence but in that Vergerio explicitly acknowledges it. In a letter of 1396, Vergerio stressed the wisdom of choosing a single master stylist for imitation, thereby renouncing the stylistic

---

Agostino Sottili, "La questione ciceroniana in una lettera di Francesco Zabarella a Francesco Petrarca," *Università e cultura: Studi sui rapporti italo-tedeschi nell età dell' umanesimo* (Goldbach, Germany, 1993), 1–34. Sottili's article was published earlier under the same title in *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 6 (1973), 25–57.

[98] The secular oration is found in Vergerio, *Epist.*, 431–36. For dating, see 431–32, n. 1. For the dating of the first sermon, see McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 121–22, n. 2. See also "Innovation in Early Humanist Rhetoric," 3–33, for a compelling analysis of Vergerio's oratorical writings and of their importance.

[99] Published in Muratori, ed., *RIS* 16, cols. 194b–98c. On the dating, see Vergerio, *Epist.*, 492–93, n. 3.

[100] That Malpaghini was a passionate student of ancient oratory is known from a letter of Bruni's. In 1406, announcing to Niccolò Niccoli that he had begun translating an oration of Demosthenes, Bruni wrote: "Res est summe luculenta et Ravennati nostro valde, ut opinor, placebit, cum refertissima sit oratoriis ornamentis": L. Bruni, *Leonardi Bruni aretini epistolarum libri VIII*, ed. L. Mehus, 2 vols. (Florence, 1741), IX.9, in 2:190. Furthermore, as we have seen, when Malpaghini endeavored to patch up a quarrel with Salutati years earlier, he dispatched a manuscript containing orations, presumably of ancient provenance.

theory of eclecticism espoused by Seneca and cited by Petrarch in justification of his own ideal. Just as painters in his own time, Vergerio wrote, took Giotto as their model, so Cicero and Virgil provided exemplars for him and his contemporaries.[101] Vergerio then set Virgil aside, concluding that in his own judgment, "Cicero surpasses all orators and poets in eloquence."[102]

As the quotation suggests, in praising Cicero's gift of speech, Vergerio was thinking primarily of oratorical eloquence. Like those who pursued the flowers, but neglected the fruits, modern orators thought that they had mastered oratory

> only if they shall have stuffed their speech with facile words resounding with great roaring.[103]

More attention must be given to meaning than to words. Vergerio then proceeded to describe what he meant by Ciceronian imitation, closely following a passage of Cicero's *Orator*:

> the words are not to be obscure or unusual, nor indiscriminately popular and childish, but those which were known and celebrated in famous authors, in such a way that consideration is always given to the character and dignity of the persons and things about which we are about to speak. Indeed, these things are so interconnected that they seem linked not fortuitously but by art. Let the speech not be rough and rude, nor abrupt and precipitous, but easy and smooth, like a sunny stream flowing continually with a mild current, and, if I may speak more accurately, coming of its own free will, not wrenched out by force.[104]

---

[101] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 177. He cites Seneca as his authority for depending on a single model. Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators*, 43–44, has suggested that Vergerio may be echoing Seneca the Elder's *Controversiae*, pref. 6. We have already mentioned the opposite advice of Seneca the Younger, *Ad Lucil.*, no. 84, which Petrarch followed. The analysis of Andrea Bolland, "Art and Humanism in Early Renaissance Padua: Cennini, Vergerio and Petrarch on Imitation," *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996): 469–87, attributes the inspiration of Cennino Cennini's early-fifteenth-century account of artistic imitation in his *Libro dell'Arte* to Petrarch and Vergerio. Given his electic position, Cennini was unambiguously dependent on Petrarch, but Bolland is not clear about what Cennini took from Vergerio, who insisted on imitating one model.

[102] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 178: "Michi vero, ut et iudicium meum audias, videtur, Ciceronem omnibus et oratoribus et poetis eloquentia prestare."

[103] Ibid.: "In quo genere magna pars errant, qui, si modo lubricis resonantibus verbis dictionem suam referserint, abunde se munus oratorium arbitrentur prestitisse."

[104] Ibid., 178: "Habenda sunt autem vocabula non obscura aut insueta, nec vero passim vulgata aut puerilia, sed que apud claros auctores cognita celebrataque sunt, ita quidem ut et personarum semper et rerum, de quibus sumus dicturi, modus dignitasque spectetur; ea vero inter se ita cohereant ut non casu coniecta sed ex arte

Because true eloquence should appear natural rather than artificial, the orator must avoid using extravagant rhetorical ornamentation, which would render his meaning unintelligible to the audience. Just as he should not make his style too elaborate, he should also avoid repeating himself constantly out of fear that he would not be understood. Rather,

> ... our speech should not be that of the common and mediocre man, not everyday speech, but a solemn and festive discourse that can be delivered publicly without fear. While it should seem accessible and easy for everyone to understand, it [such discourse] will be attainable by none, or at any rate only by a few.[105]

Although such an approach was appropriate for most occasions, Vergerio recognized that in certain cases, especially in a courtroom, a more vehement kind of speech might be required. In his own day, however, when cases were adjudicated primarily on the basis of written documents, he argued that judicial eloquence really had no place. Having laid down what he considered to be general principles for

---

commissa videantur. Sit sermo non scaber aut horridus, non preruptus, non preceps, sed lenis et planus, apricique in morem rivi continuo mollique cursu defluens, et, ut prope dixerim, sponte veniens, non vi pertractus."

Vergerio probably drew selectively for this description of oratorical style on Cicero's *Orator*, XI.37–42. At the outset (37), Cicero characterizes epideictic speeches generally as "absunt a forensi contentione." A few paragraphs below (39), Cicero criticizes the prose of Thrasymachus of Chalcedon and Gorgias of Leontini "quorum satis arguta multa sed ut modo primumque nascentia minuta et versiculorum similia quaedam nimiumque depicta" and praises that of Herodotus which is "sine ullis salebris quasi sedatus amnis fluit ...." Below (40), Theodorus is said to have constructed prose rhymes "praefractior nec satis ... rotundus ...." Such comments on the Greek orators recall Vergerio's "Sit sermo non scaber ... pertractus," above. Again (42) Cicero describes the epideictic style as "Dulce igitur orationis genus et solutum et fluens, sententiis argutum, verbis sonans est." He endorses this definition later at XIX.65, when in defining the epideictic oration as congenial to the sophist he writes: "Cum sit eis propositum non perturbare animos sed placare potius, nec tam persuadere quam delectare, et apertius id faciunt quam nos et crebrius."

Vergerio's editor finds no reference to the *Orator* in Vergerio's work, but Vergerio almost certainly had access to a manuscript containing the passages above. Albeit in a mutilated form, portions of the work were known by the time of Vergerio's writing. Petrarch had available *Orator*, XXVI.91, in Troyes 552 (Pierre de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, 2 vols. [Paris, 1907], 1:229–30; and Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:128). Salutati cites *Orator*, V.17, in Salutati, *Epist.*, 1:338 and 3:62.

[105] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 179: "Ut non vulgaris sed moderati hominis sit sermo noster, non quotidianus sed solemnis atque festivus, et qui in publicum prodire non formidet, quique, dum unicuique proximus et facilis ut assequi possit videatur, a nemine certe vel paucis pertingi queat."

attaining eloquence, he directed his correspondent, eager to learn the art, to continue his study by consulting the rules given by other writers and "especially ... that fountain of eloquence, Cicero."

Vergerio's treatise on education, *De ingenuis moribus* (1402), reinforced the author's tendency to follow the ancient identification of eloquence with oratory.[106] As one of the three major subjects at the center of Vergerio's program of education, along with history and moral philosophy, the study of eloquence was intended to teach the student how to persuade his audience effectively to follow the moral examples and the precepts provided by the other two disciplines. It was no novelty that a humanist should make this connection between the three branches of learning, but Vergerio appears simply to equate the art of eloquence with oratory, which, he emphasized, was primarily important in public life. Describing the three categories of oration current in ancient times, judicial, deliberative, and epideictic, Vergerio eliminated the first two as no longer employed in modern society. While he acknowledged that the third form was still practiced in his own day, he observed that his contemporaries used those arts "which are against the art of speaking well."[107] One of the major goals of his educational program, therefore, was to train the student "so that in all kinds of cases he may speak ornately and copiously from training." Presumably the eloquence that he meant to attain was the eloquence that he described in his letter of 1396, based on a study of Cicero's orations.

The superficial character of Vergerio's oratorical style is perhaps best illustrated by an analysis of the opening passage of his one judicial oration. Presumably delivered before Francesco Carrara, it was designed to convince Carrara to recall his former condottiere Bartolomeo Cermisone, who, when Francesco abandoned Padua in 1388, remained behind and took service with Giangaleazzo Visconti. Delivered sometime between June 1390, when Carrara returned to Padua, and late January 1392, when Cermisone was officially recalled, the speech generally followed the format of the two orations delivered by Cicero before Julius Caesar, *Pro Ligario* and *Pro rege*

[106] McManamon, "Innovation in Humanist Rhetoric," 8. The general thrust of Vergerio's program of moral reform was toward the development of the individual and his capacity to assume a public role. See McManamon's extensive analysis of the work: *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 89–103, esp. 97–98.

[107] *De ingenuis moribus et liberalibus studiis adulescentiae*, ed. A. Gnesotto, in *Atti e memorie della reale Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti in Padova*, n.s., 34 (1917–18): 124.

Deiotaro. Both those orations, pleas for Caesar's clemency on behalf of Cicero's clients, were, like Vergerio's, directed not to a jury but to a powerful individual. The *Pro Ligario* is especially relevant in that Ligario, like Cermisone, was accused of having taken sides with an enemy, an act for which he now sought pardon.[108]

The exordium addressed to Carrara provides an accurate representation of the style of the whole document:

> Multa michi verba facienda essent pro impetranda venia, mitissime princeps, nisi te et natura et moribus, ut ex preclaris facinoribus tuis compertum habeo, clementem mansuetumque cognoscerem. Omnes enim orantes tunc valida argumenta conquisivisse se putant, cum ipsius iudicis aut aliorum de simili re sententias pro se habent. Ego quidem multa et insignia aliorum principum benignitatis exempla adducere possem, que renumerare tentantem dies visque loquendi deficeret; sed nulla utique maiora, nulla magis memoranda se offerunt quam que tu ex abundantissima clementia perfecisti.[109]

The paragraph was artfully constructed. Vergerio successfully achieved inner clausal balance by pairing nouns as well as adjectives (*natura et moribus*, *clementem mansuetumque*, *multa et insignia*) and by using parallel phrasing (*verba facienda ... impetranda venia* and *nulla utique maiora*, *nulla magis memoranda*). Note as well the opposition between *verba* and *facina* and the play on *facienda* and *facinoribus* in the first

[108] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 431–33. McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 47–48, provides the historical background. Although the ancient manuals prescribed a six-part oration, *exordium*, *narratio*, *partitio*, *confirmatio*, *refutatio*, and *conclusio*, neither Vergerio's nor Cicero's two orations here have a *partitio*. In a way closely resembling the approach of Cicero with Caesar, Vergerio lauds Francesco for bestowing clemency even on those who had betrayed him. Vergerio's *narratio* begins on 433, line 16, when the author links the idea of Francesco's clemency to Cermisone's appeal for pardon: "Quapropter innatam tibi clementiam, que etiam ad perfidos et parricidas attigit, redde viro forti et fideli insontique proli eius, nec pati velis ut benemerite virtutis premia perfidia occupet." Having established the facts of the case, Vergerio enters into the *confirmatio* (434, line 24). The *refutatio* and the *conclusio* follow (435, line 17, and 436, line 8, respectively).

[109] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 431–33. The passage reads in translation: "I would need many words to seek your pardon, O most gentle of princes, did I not know, as I have discovered from your famous deeds, that you are by nature and habits clement and mild. For all those petitioning in these circumstances think that they have acquired valid arguments when they employ for themselves opinions of the judge himself or of others in a similar case. I would be able to adduce many and distinguished examples of the kindness of other princes, which time and my ability to speak would not suffice to reiterate, but no really greater examples, no more worthy of memory, present themselves than those that you have brought to completion out of a most abundant clemency."

sentence. Nonetheless, the opening line is not classical: *facienda essent* should be *facienda erant* and *que remunerare tentantem* is awkward.

All the same, the structure of Vergerio's sentence was not Ciceronian. The Ciceronian period consisted of a number of well-articulated clauses, usually defined by the positioning of verbs, clauses commonly balanced with one another by antithesis and parallelism, and dependent both for their syntactical function and their meaning on a principal clause, primarily on the verb of that clause. The elements of the period were so organically related to one another that the reader or listener had to forgo understanding the parts until the whole had been heard or read.[110] By contrast, Vergerio structured his sentence linearly or paratactically so that it conveyed its meaning in sequence. Working with a looser system of subordination, Vergerio's defense of Cermisone failed to achieve the emotional intensity of the Ciceronian model, *Pro Ligario*.

With the exception of his defense of Cermisone, Vergerio's other speeches from the 1390s – his speech of June 1392 celebrating the second anniversary of Francesco Novello's return to power, that for the funeral of Francesco il Vecchio in September 1393, and a series of speeches delivered beginning in 1391 in honor of St. Jerome – for whom he had an especial attachment – are organized in the tripartite format prescribed by the *Ad Herennium* for epideictic oration, that is, exordium, narration, and conclusion (peroration).[111] According to tradition, for the Carrara funeral speech (*eloquium*) and the speeches devoted to St. Jerome, Vergerio would have been expected to use the *ars predicandi* with its theme, *protheme*, and other elaborate divisions, while for his secular speech praising Carrara, he would have followed the rules of *ars arengandi* and more generally of *ars dictaminis*.[112]

---

[110] I have not mentioned the importance of prose metric in the Ciceronian conception of the period, because, until the 1420s and recovery of Cicero's *Orator*, humanists were not clear as to Cicero's doctrine of *numerus* in the works they knew. See Remigio Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini veronese* (Catania, 1896), 73–75.

[111] For detailed description of the orations, see McManamon, "Innovation in Humanist Rhetoric," 8–11 and 17–28; and idem, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, s.v. "Oratory" in McManamon's index. For the circumstances surrounding the speeches on the Carrara, see Benjamin Kohl, *Padua under the Carrara, 1318–1405* (Baltimore and London, 1974), 303–04 and 307–08.

[112] Vergerio indicates at the outset of sermon 5 (1392) that he is altering the usual form of sermon composition: "... praetermittam nunc parumper solitum morem sermoncinandi, et, omisso themate (qui mos iam apud modernos deciderat) primo gloriosissimam virginem ad auxilium mihi invocabo ....": McManamon, *Sermones de-*

Presumably Vergerio considered the orations for the Carrara family to be secular in character, because he employed the same classicizing style in them that he did in his judicial oration. For his series of epideictic orations on St. Jerome, delivered in a church, he employed a very personal form of discourse quite unlike that of the *ars predicandi*. While the *ars predicandi* conceived of sermons as pursuing an argument and establishing a general truth or principle as their goal, Vergerio's sermons endeavored to create a picture in the minds of listeners by means of extensive description: using the saint's own words, for example, they exhaustively described the life of St. Jerome in his solitary retreat. Vergerio aimed not so much at convincing his audience as at inspiring in them admiration for his subject.[113]

The opening sentence of his *Sermo 5* (1392) provides a good example of his sermon style:

> Sermo mihi hodie ad vos habendus est, viri clarissimi, non de studiis litterarum ut saepe soleo, non de bellicis rebus quae, ut difficiles fieri, ita iucundae sunt memoratu, non denique de ullis negotiis quae aut ad publica iura hominum aut ad privatas res pertineant, sed de religione et sanctitate. Neque enim vereor, viri optimi, ne, cum de religione dicturum me pollicitus sim, parum attentas aures praestituri sitis. Novi devotionem vestra, pietatem, devotionem, fidem, palamque ab universis perpetuo scitum est, cum summo studio in omni vita honestissimas res colueritis, divina tamen iura caerimoniasque sacrorum primo semper apud vos loco constitisse. [114]

The first sentence offers a complex parallelism with the short clauses *non de*, *non de*, *non denique de*, and finally, to complete the antithesis, *sed de*. Each of the first three, moreover, is followed by a clause suggesting the appropriateness of the topic (*ut*, *ut*, *quae*), so that lack of a modifying clause after the final choice highlights its importance. Fur-

---

cem pro Sancto Hieronymo (Tempe, Ariz., 1999), 170. Cf. McManamon, *PierPaolo Vergerio*, 132.

[113] O'Malley, *Praise and Blame*, 52–53.

[114] McManamon, *Sermones decem*, 170 and 172: "O illustrious men, I am going to deliver a sermon to you today, not about the study of literature as I am often wont to do, nor of military accomplishments, which, as they are difficult to perform, so they are sweet to remember, nor finally of any matters that pertain either to the public rights of men or to private affairs, but rather to religion and holiness. Nor do I fear, O, best of men, that, since I have promised to speak about religion, you will pay too little attention. I know your devotion, piety, moderation, and faith; and it is always recognized openly by everyone that, since you have cultivated the most honorable things your whole lives with all your hearts, nevertheless, divine laws and sacred rites have taken first place for you."

ther antithesis was created by opposing *difficiles* to *iucundae* and *publica* to *privatas*.

Traces of dictaminal tradition remained: an obsessive reliance on the superlative adjectival form: *viri clarissimi optimi* and *praestantissimi* in this passage continues throughout the sermon. Vergerio still favors the use of abstract nouns such as *sanctitas* and *vestram devotionem*. While the sermon indicates mastery of indirect discourse and consistently correct rendition of purpose and result clauses, occasional errors creep in, some of which may be the fault of scribes. The consistent confusion of *sui* and *eius*, however, and the use of *quo* for *ut* in clauses where no comparison occurs both suggest that Vergerio himself is the culprit. The phrase *difficiles fieri* reflects a confusion between poetic and prose usage common among later Renaissance humanists, but the opening phrase (*Sermo mihi hodie ad vos habendus est*) would clearly have been unacceptable to them. The classicizing effort is further weakened by the fact that the sentence trails off with a prepositional phrase. Nonetheless, Vergerio's use of standard *cursus* in the sermons, which stands at less than 50 per cent, indicates that he has broken with medieval metric.[115]

As with Cermisone, the sermons on Jerome are examples of humanist oratorical prose but are not Ciceronian. Despite the complexity of the parallelism and the antitheses, the underlying structure remains essentially paratactic. Given Vergerio's express commitment to Ciceronian oratory, we can only conclude that he was not aware of his failure. While his discourse was more flowing and syntactically correct than Cino's declamation on the evils of rhetoric, nonetheless, Cino at least had a better sense of what constructing a Ciceronian period entailed.

Despite his failure to achieve success in imitating Ciceronian style, Vergerio's loyalty to his Ciceronian model and especially to its rules for epideictic oratory went beyond stylistic innovation to exert a transforming effect on the interpretation of St. Jerome's life. According to the author of the *Ad Herennium*, the epideictic oration developed its treatment of the subject to be praised or blamed according to a set of basic categories: virtues or faults of character, physical advantages or disadvantages, and external circumstances.[116] This threefold structure involved discussion of the descent and education of the

[115] See appendix.

[116] *Ad Her.*, III.6–7, contains the rules.

individual, of qualities such as his strength or agility, and finally whether his acts were just, courageous, temperate, and wise. Loyalty to such a model exerted what can only be described as a secularizing influence on Vergerio's treatment of the early Church Father. Eschewing the miraculous in Jerome's biography, Vergerio tended to parallel the saint's service to the Church with that of an ancient statesman or military hero of the *patria*. Just as the ancient orators celebrated the birthdays of eminent men, Vergerio declared in sermon 2, so he intended to deliver an encomium of Jerome.[117] Sermon 7, in fact, depicted the Church as a *respublica*:

> For, just as in these [well-run states] there are certain outstanding men and leaders of cities appointed to going on legations, surveying the provinces, and strengthening the population in peace and social harmony, so in our church the apostles hold this place. Likewise, there are others of courageous spirit and superb fitness who, since they do not fear death, are assigned to protecting cities with their arms and defending them with their strength. In our faith the martyrs hold this place, who, gifted with firm minds and the fervor of faith, have suffered innumerable and almost intolerable pains.[118]

Vergerio described at length the tasks of learned Christian leaders, who, even if they lacked physical strength, were concerned with "public good, justice, and equity." Specifically, they were delegated

> to correcting the people, animating soldiers with an oration, and encouraging individuals on behalf of the public welfare.[119]

---

[117] McManamon, *Sermones*, 144: "Nam si natales hominum dies celebrare gentilitas caeca solebat, quibus erant in hanc vitam adducti miseriarum et omnis angustiae plenam, quanto nos magis vera fide illuminati sanctorum Dei festa colere debemus, quibus in vitam mortis [in]noxiam, calamitatis ignaram, omnisque adversitatis immunem translati sunt!" My interpretation of Vergerio's secularity in these sermons is substantially drawn from McManamon, "Innovation in Early Humanist Rhetoric," 25–27. McManomon recognizes Vergerio's continued praise of Jerome's ascetic withdrawal and cautions that "the sermons do not supply an unequivocal endorsement of the active life" (*Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 133).

[118] McManamon, *Sermones decem*, 208: "Nam, ut illis sunt praestantes quidam homines et primores urbium ad agendas legationes circuendasque provincias et populos in pace et societate confirmandos instituti, ita in ecclesia nostra apostoli [hoc] locum obtinent. Sunt item alii magno spiritu excellentique robore corporis qui, cum mortem non exhorreant, ad tutandas armis defendendasque viribus urbes dati sunt. Quo loco sunt in fide nostra martyres qui, grandi animo et fidei fervore dotati, innumerabilia ac paene intolerabilia supplicia passi sunt."

[119] Ibid., 208. The Latin reads: "Ex quibus [these learned leaders] sunt qui ad corrigendum populum, ad animandos oratione milites singulosque pro salute publica adhortandos constituti sunt ...."

They also served posterity through their holy writings. While they had not suffered martyrdom for their faith, nonetheless, like courageous soldiers who die in peace without wounds, they were not afraid to suffer injury and death "pro salute patriae."

Glorious among such highly educated men, Jerome, through his prayers, learning, and teaching, gave countless benefits to the Christian community. While stressing the saint's pursuit of the contemplative life, including his choice of the desert over the Roman papacy, Vergerio, guided by the secular character of the pagan epideictic model, envisaged Jerome's withdrawal into seclusion as his way of fulfilling his "civic" duty toward his fellow Christians. Implicitly granting that the primary loyalty of the individual believer was to God, Vergerio's orations, nonetheless, tended to highlight the active dimensions of Jerome's life, and, what is more, to dramatize his life of withdrawal as a public service.

Although Vergerio doubtless felt a strong attachment to his patron saint, his writings give little evidence of deep religious commitment. For example, when he outlined the ideal education of a young man in the *De ingenuis moribus*, Vergerio did not mention religious instruction at all, nor the need to integrate secular studies with religious concerns. Silence on such issues would have been unthinkable for Petrarch or Salutati. Already with Vergerio, the preoccupation with Cicero was tending to lessen the relevance of Christianity to the new scholarship; when, subsequently, in other hands, classical prescriptions for oratory were combined with a concentrated effort at recapturing Ciceronian style, secularization of language and thought would become pervasive.

From the early 1390s, the Paduan public had a good deal of exposure to Vergerio's new approach to oration. His speech of June 1392 celebrating the second year of Francesco Novello's return to power and his funeral oration of September 1393 marking the death of Francesco's father, Francesco il Vecchio, were stellar occasions for the young man to display his new conception of oratory. The sermons on Jerome, moreover, seem to have drawn large crowds. In 1394, Vergerio reported to a friend, to whom he was sending a copy of his sermons, that a huge crowd (*ingens turba*) had attended the performances:

> there were many unlearned who followed only the sound of the words and the gestures; more who observed the style of the speech and who

> censured me if something was spoken ineptly; and some, perhaps, if I may allow myself to say so, who were edified.[120]

It was Padua, therefore, that first witnessed the fruits of Malpaghini's call for imitation of Cicero and particularly Ciceronian oration, a call that would cause a major shift in emphasis among fifth-generation Italian humanists. It is difficult to know the extent of the diffusion of Vergerio's compositions among the learned public beyond his city. We may suppose, however, that by correspondence and visits to Florence, Vergerio kept his friends there informed of his writings and provided them with proof of the feasibility of incorporating current rhetorical tendencies into public discourse. Ultimately he may also have had a significant role in the conversion of the Venetian patriciate to humanism.

To Vergerio's influence, moreover, may be ascribed the change that occurred in his generation in the understanding of Cicero's cultural and historical role in Roman antiquity. Captivated by study of Cicero's newly discovered *Ad familiares*, Vergerio produced an analysis in the mid-1390s of Cicero's biography that provided an outline for interpreting Cicero's life that is still accepted down to the present day. Likely written upon Vergerio's return in the fall of 1394 from Florence, where he had had access to a manuscript of the *Ad familiares* that had been discovered by Salutati in 1392, his defense of Cicero's career took the form of a reply to Petrarch's attack on the ancient Roman in book XXIV, letter 2, of his *Rerum familiarium.*[121]

Together with the earlier-known *Ad Atticum*, Cicero's newly discovered letters, vividly portraying the struggle of the champion of republicanism against the growing menace of tyranny, had already led Salutati between 1392 and 1394 to make some of the most negative remarks in his work on the establishment and conduct of imperial

---

[120] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 93: "Multi preterea indocti qui nudas voces gestusque notarent, plurimi qui dicendi tantum genus adverterent arguerentque, si quid ineptius excidisset, aliqui fortasse, si michi liceat, qui ediscerent."

[121] A. Sottili, "La questione ciceroniana," attributes to Zabarella a brief letter defending Cicero against Petrarch's accusations (55–57). Sottili convincingly argues that Vergerio drew the outline for his own more elaborate defense from Zabarella's work. The sequence of events is difficult to establish, but I think it probable that Zabarella's composition was inspired by his frequent evening discussions with Vergerio, who, returning from Florence in 1394, brought knowledge of the contents of the *Ad familiares* and perhaps a manuscript of some or all of the letters. On the intimacy of their contact in Padua, see Vergerio, *Epist.*, 107.

rule. Nevertheless, the effect of the *Ad familiares* on Salutati soon dissipated. Two years later, as we have seen, Salutati would find it impossible to envisage the battle for Roman republicanism outside the context of a divinely ordained world, in which republicanism was an evil enterprise that pitted human pride against God's decrees.

Perhaps inspired by discussions with Salutati in the summer of 1394, Vergerio responded sharply to Petrarch's criticism of Cicero for betraying philosophy by his commitment to politics and for acting in a contradictory manner in his relations with prominent leaders of his day.[122] Replying in Cicero's name, Vergerio maintained that in whatever Cicero did, he pursued the common good and the safety of the Republic. Opposing Petrarch's preference for the contemplative life, Vergerio's Cicero defended himself as follows:

> For this to me has always seemed the mature and foremost philosophy, which inhabits cities and flees solitude; which desires good things both for itself and for the whole people and desires to be of advantage to as many as possible.[123]

Rather than a blot on Cicero's reputation, his political activity became his glory. Only through a commitment to the active life could the scholar fulfill himself.

Vergerio then turned to justify Cicero's opposition to Caesar. That Caesar exercised clemency toward his enemies was of little importance.

> For just as the very name of cruelty is hateful in a free city, so is the name of clemency – because we would not easily get accustomed to calling a man "clement" if he could not also be cruel with impunity.[124]

---

[122] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 436–45. In a letter of 1405 to Salutati, Bruni indicates some knowledge of Vergerio's letter. After referring to Petrarch's letters of criticism, Bruni writes: "... et hoc a nostris vatibus scriptum est, ut, quoniam viventes non sufficiebant, mortuos quoque suis epistolis lacesserent": *Epist.*, X.5; 2:172. Cf. Vergerio, *Epist.*, 437, n. 1. Bruni certainly had the letter in his possession in 1415 when he was writing his own life of Cicero: see ibid., n. 1. See also McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 52–57, for an analysis of Vergerio's letter. McManamon points out that Zabarella joined Vergerio in endorsing Cicero's public service (ibid., 54–55).

[123] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 444: "Ea enim michi matura semper et prestans philosophia visa est, que in urbibus habitat et solitudinem fugit, que cum sibi tum communibus studet commodis, et prodesse quam plurimis cupit."

[124] Ibid., 441: "Nam, ut in libera civitate nomen ipsum crudelitatis odiosum est, ita et clementie invidiosum, nec facile solemus quenquam clementem dicere, nisi qui et crudelis impune esse possit."

Vergerio's Cicero would have opposed any usurper who acted in this way, just as he opposed Augustus when, after promising to govern in the name of the senate and people, Augustus

> destroyed liberty to become a tyrant – he who could have been the first citizen of a flowering commonwealth.[125]

What is the significance of this work for the thought of Vergerio? While the defense represents, as Baron puts it, "the first genuine historical understanding of the spirit of the *Respublica Romana* and its last defenders," Vergerio's sympathetic account of Cicero's actions remained a historical judgment, from which, in the 1390s, he drew no political lessons about the best form of government.[126] And in an undated, unfinished work on political constitutions, written before 1404, Vergerio, confronted with the paradox that monarchy can be both the best and the worst of governments, committed himself to monarchy, apparently on the grounds that any other regime would be uniformly bad.[127] He gave every indication, moreover, that he sincerely felt that the government of the Carrara represented the monarchical principle in its highest form.

Consequently, if Vergerio's positive evaluation of Cicero's career had political as well as historical implications, we should look for them in Vergerio's generic conception of the ideal active life in state service open to the learned man regardless of the state's constitution. The enduring presence in Vergerio's thought of St. Jerome's monastic example impeded any *categorical* affirmation of the superior virtues of the active over the contemplative life, but as we have seen, Vergerio even managed to recast the saint's life so as to give it civic dimensions.[128] Paradoxically, Vergerio's "Ciceronianism" laid the groundwork for what would become "signorial" civic humanism. It

---

[125] Ibid., 443. The whole period reads: "Quando vero etatis errores improborumque consilia secutus maluit, eversa libertate, ut esset tyrannus, qui princeps civis esse, florente urbe, poterat."

[126] Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, 1966), 128.

[127] Vergerio, *Epist.*, 447–50. For its dating between 1390 and 1404, see ibid., 447, n. 1. However, Baron's more detailed analysis gives the date of 1400–1405 (*Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, 1st ed., 2 vols. [Princeton, 1955], 2:488, n. 25), which seems justified to me. In addition to the editor's notes, see as well Conrad Bischoff, *Studien zu P.P. Vergerio dem Älteren*, Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte, no. 15 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1909), 31–35.

[128] McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 133.

offered princes an ideal of public service fortified by ancient pagan and Christian precedent but detached from the republican context in which Ciceronianism had originated.

Despite Vergerio's achievements, subsequent generations had mixed responses to his writings. His *De ingenuis moribus* became a school text in the early fifteenth century, and even a fastidious Ciceronian like Gasparino Barzizza lectured on it in the classroom. While not "Ciceronian," its style articulated the author's ideas with sufficient clarity and richness of expression to merit Bartolomeo Facio's praise of the work's *nitor verborum* (shining words).[129] Paolo Cortesi, judging by later, stricter standards, did not agree. Having read the book as a boy, he described the composition as "not elegant enough to be appreciated in this more learned age."[130]

Certainly Bartolomeo Platina's judgment on Vergerio, cited at the outset of the chapter, was too harsh. In his own way honoring Vergerio by setting him alongside Petrarch, Platina considered Vergerio a forerunner of Barzizza, Bruni, Poggio, and others who, capitalizing on previous efforts, made Latin studies flourish and rendered them glorious. Even if we accept the judgment of Vergerio's successors that he failed to imitate Cicero, his dedication to the attempt and to the genre of oratory set him first of all on the path that would lead others of his generation into a new age marked by new standards of eloquence.

5

I have reserved to the next chapters a description of that new age, which I have entitled the "first Ciceronianism" to distinguish it from the mature Ciceronianism of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth

[129] Bartolomeo Facio, *De viris illustribus liber* (Florence, 1745), 8: "Scripsit de ingenuis moribus librum unum valde laudatum tum rebus, tum ipso nitore verborum."

[130] Cortesi, *De hominibus doctis*, 28. Cortesi compares him with Polenton and finds him "ornatior, non tamen adeo cultus, ut sit hac eruditiori aetate tolerabilis." He continues: "Libellus *de adolescentia*, quem pueri legebamus, vix comparet, et bene olet (ut dicitur) quod nihil olet."

It should be said that Vergerio's correspondence was less innovative than his orations or his *De ingenuis moribus*. From the earliest letter, written at sixteen, to the last, the correspondence retained a flavor of the Trecento and remained singularly unaffected by Vergerio's involvement with Cicero's letter collection.

centuries. But no account of its birth would be complete without recognizing the contribution made to the future of oratory by the *Inquisitio artis in orationibus Ciceronis*, written in the mid-to-late 1390s by Antonio Loschi while a member of the Giangaleazzo's chancery.[131] Already before 1392, Loschi had manifested his interests in oratory with his translation of the pseudo-Quintilian work, the *Declamationes*.[132] His collection of excerpts from the elder Seneca's *Controversia* (*Libellus declamationum controversalium*), as well as his research on the *Ad Herennium*, may also predate the *Inquisitio*.[133] To what extent can Loschi's rhetorical interests be ascribed to his contacts with Florence? Although his time in the city was brief, epistolary exchanges with Florentines followed over the ensuing years, and although no letters survive, he may have maintained a correspondence with Vergerio. That his teacher at Pavia, Giovanni Travesi, who held the chair of grammar at the *studio* when Loschi studied there from 1388, had anything to do with his oratorical interests seems unlikely in view of Travesi's known writings. Nor would Travesi have been responsible for inspiring Gasparino Barzizza, fellow student of Loschi and later a master Ciceronian. Taking his *laurea* in 1392, Barzizza left Pavia for Bergamo soon after and did not return to Milan until about 1400. Indeed, it may be that Loschi's *Inquisitio* actually sparked Barzizza's oratorical interests.[134]

No oration of Loschi exists from his school years, but the invective that he directed against the Florentines in 1397 suggests his continued loyalty to Trecento humanist style if only by the paratactic structure of the sentences:

> Illucebit ne unquam dies, perditissimi cives, vastatores patriae, et quietis Italiae turbatores, quo dignam vestris sceleribus poenam meritumque

[131] Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 2:123, estimates that the work was written about 1395, which Garin emends to 1399 (278). It is unlikely that Loschi would have been able to complete such a detailed study of the orations after becoming Visconti chancellor (i.e., after the summer of 1398) (Girgensohn, "Antonio Loschi," 21). Of the eleven single orations, two, *Pro Quinto* and *Pro Flacco*, appear for the first time in the Trecento. On Astolfino Marinoni, the dedicatee, see Eugenio Garin, "La cultura milanese nella prima metà del XV secolo," in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 6 (Milan, 1955), 553, n. 1. For the birthdate of Loschi, see Girgensohn, "Antonio Loschi," 8.

[132] Remigio Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini* (Catania, 1914; rpt. Padua, 1974), 23. A manuscript of the work, BNF, *Magl.*, VI, 171, is dated 1392.

[133] Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, 23–24.

[134] On Travesi, see Garin, "La cultura milanese," 573–75. On Barzizza's career, see G. Martellotti, "Barzizza, Gasparino," *DBI* 7 (1965), 34–39.

> supplicium consequamini? Dabiturne [dies?] aliquando vestrae cuiuspiam calamitatis insignis exemplo, sic vestri similes deterreri, et sic in aerumnis vestris suum formidare discrimen, ut calamitas illa videatur non solum iusta in ultione, sed etiam utilis in exemplo?[135]

Each clause here progressively enlarges the meaning of the whole period. Clauses are juxtaposed rather than interlocked. We may wonder why he does not end the second sentence in Ciceronian style with *videatur*.

While Vergerio had been concerned early on with oratorical compositions for a general audience, Loschi's concern with the art of Ciceronian oratory was more academic. Designed primarily for scholars, the *Inquisitio*'s insightful application of the discussions of rhetoric found in the standard Ciceronian manuals and the *De oratore* to Cicero's actual orations is an amazing accomplishment, given that the author had to work without access to the ancient commentaries on Cicero's oratory, the first of which was discovered only in 1416 by Poggio.[136]

Writing at the request of Astolfino Marinoni, a close friend, that he "search and clearly uncover the more secret part of the art [of oratory] in them [Cicero's orations]," Loschi endeavored to ferret out what art had hidden: "For this is the case with the greatest art: indeed not to show art when speaking but to hide it."[137] Just as Vergerio did, Loschi identified eloquence with oratory and Cicero as

---

[135] E. Garin, *Prosatori latini*, 8. Loschi's treatise is known through Salutati's response. Salutati's method was to move systematically through Loschi's work, citing a passage and responding to it. Loschi's composition certainly dates from the time of his employment at Giangaleazzo's court, but because he sent the diatribe in his own name, it must be considered an independently authored work. Therefore, he was not necessarily constrained by *dictamen* rules when composing it.

The English translation is as follows: "Will the day ever come, o you criminals, destroyers of the mother country, ruin of the peace of Italy, in which you will pay a penalty worthy of your crimes and undergo merited punishment? Will it never be that with the example of your vast downfall those like you will be terrified and led to fear their own ruin in yours, so that your misfortune not only appear as just revenge but also as a useful example?" The phrase "Dabiturne ... discrimen" is syntactically defective.

Loschi's style later in life remained substantially the same: see detailed analysis of his speech of 1409, *Pro unione ecclesiae* and text, in Girgensohn, "Antonio Loschi," 67–92. On Loschi in the papal curia, see Germano Gualdo, "Antonio Loschi, segretario apostolico (1406–1436)," *Archivio storico italiano* 147 (1989): 749–69.

[136] Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 1:78.

[137] *Inquisitio super XI orationes Ciceronis, in Q. Asconii Paediani patavini ad filios commentarii* (Paris, 1536), 135.

the greatest orator: "There is nothing more elegant, nothing richer, nothing more ornate than these [Cicero's] oratorical writings."[138] Following a preface exploring the question of whether oratorical skill could be taught, Loschi moved on to a detailed analysis of the eleven orations, two of which had not even been mentioned by previous writers. After providing the historical background for each, Loschi placed it into one of the three basic categories (deliberative, judicial, or epideictic). He was careful to note that while an oration generally belonged to one category, in its subordinate parts it might take the form of one or both of the other two. In part three of the analysis of each deliberative and judicial oration, he defined the issues involved. After discussing the arrangement of the parts of the speech, he gave the most space to explaining the content of each part and examining the variety of argumentation at work. In the final section of analysis, Loschi discussed what he considered the most important rhetorical figures and tropes used by Cicero in the speech – although he admitted from the beginning that he would not present them all.[139]

Loschi's book on Cicero's orations, while liberally providing examples of Cicero's prose to illustrate various rhetorical colors, did not include an analysis of Cicero's style. Nonetheless, his detailed study of Cicero's construction of his orations rendered these masterpieces more accessible for those who aimed not merely (as Loschi did himself) to master the formal instructions for how to build an oration and organize its arguments but to re-create something approaching the style in which the orations had been composed. Because his passion for Cicero did not take him as far as emulation, Loschi himself may be regarded as a forerunner, not a member, of the new age of eloquence.

On the threshold of an analysis of the first Ciceronianism, it seems proper to recall once again the role in its genesis of Giovanni Malpaghini of Ravenna, whose classroom became the site for the creation of a new aesthetic destined to underlie the writings of the

[138] Ibid.

[139] Loschi's work proved immensely popular in the fifteenth century. At least a half-dozen editions had made their way into print by 1515. Less important, because more cursory in its treatment of the material, is Sicco Polenton's *Argumenta super aliquot orationibus et invectivis Ciceronis*. Written about 1413, it deals with the sixteen orations that were known in the period and not analyzed by Loschi: Arnaldo Segarizzi, *La Catania, le orazioni e le epistole di Sicco Polenton, umanista trentino del secolo XV*, Biblioteca storica della letteratura italiana, no. 5 (Bergamo, 1899), xli.

leading humanist stylists among the next generation, many of whom had been his pupils. Although his contribution suffered over time from the vagaries of modern scholarship and from his own failure to write, by the time of his death, about 1422, he could be assured that his teaching had borne abundant fruit.

CHAPTER NINE

LEONARDO BRUNI

Salutati's Tuscan disciples, primarily Bruni and Poggio, rescued humanism from the dead end where Salutati had left it. Unknowingly, they revived the earlier, secular spirit of humanism, which had been displaced by Petrarch's amalgam of Christianity and pagan culture. Salutati had endeavored to readapt Petrarchan humanism to the urban lay milieu where humanism had originated, but his mind, which was more dialectical and less aware of nuance than Petrarch's, found the inner contradictions too much, and ultimately Salutati was led to make statements whose import discredited much of his own life's work.

The beginning years of the fifteenth century marked the establishment of a new ancient model, in which Seneca was definitively replaced by Cicero. Although Petrarch only rarely imitated a Senecan text generically, the character of Petrarch's prose, with its fondness for sententious moralizing, copious allusions, and direct quotations, bore striking resemblances to Seneca's. Just as Seneca renounced the ancient Roman view of the primarily political individual in favor of a richer vision of human experience that enhanced the value of the private man, so Petrarch considered private life the central arena for his efforts toward moral improvement. Public life, fraught with temptations and dangers, remained for Petrarch an object of suspicion difficult to reconcile with the studies he felt essential to ethical reform.

Salutati believed that the modern age had no need of Cicero's oratorical skills except perhaps in preaching; in 1379, he praised Petrarch's "quiet manner of speaking" as appropriate to the times. Salutati's own prose, while less resonant with Senecan echoes and more given to contentious formulations, displayed a similar penchant for abstract ethical ruminations. The contrast between the mature Salutati's dictaminal public style and his private style reflected his struggle to reconcile his commitment to Petrarchan humanism with his daily life. Although in 1399, in *De nobilitate*, Salutati identified public service as a Christian duty, what might have led in the last years of his life to an appeal for vigorous political participation was

undercut by his unquestioning belief in the sacral character of a political hierarchy endorsed by the immanent activity of Divine Providence in world affairs.

The first Ciceronians of the early fifteenth century, whom I mentioned in the last chapter, did not seek to ape the ancient Roman orator, as extreme Ciceronians at the end of the century did. Instead, the first Ciceronians' imitative efforts were generic in character. Cicero offered the fifth generation of humanists a concept of the active life of the citizen expressed in a language inducing assent in readers or listeners and, when appropriate, stirring them to action. Although a few among the new Ciceronians, like Ambrogio Traversari, were devout clerics, most had little concern for religious issues. While Ciceronianism did not initiate a move toward secularism, the secular tendency among humanists, already encountered in Vergerio, was enhanced by what we may call a shift in linguistic paradigms initiated by Florentines like Bruni and Poggio, a shift that generated a vocabulary ill-suited to Christian religious expression.

The introduction of the new paradigms sprang both from stylistic developments around 1400 and from events external to rhetoric. While the first Ciceronianism appears to have been initiated by Malpaghini's teaching and the techniques of imitation pioneered by Leonardo Bruni, the enthusiastic reception of the innovation throughout Italy can only be understood by looking beyond aesthetic considerations. This chapter will examine the rise of Ciceronianism as it appeared in Florence in the years around 1400. Chapter 10 will trace the diffusion of Ciceronian humanism within Florence and beyond.

1

As we have already seen, Petrarch's eclecticism in prose forestalled an in-depth study of any ancient author's particular style. Charged with confecting a form of personal expression, largely from elements found in ancient writers, Petrarch's followers tended to consider ancient Latin as a medley of styles rather than organically, as a language whose syntax and lexicon developed over time. Any effort to capture the style of a particular ancient writer was considered to be a falsification of one's own expressive powers. Although it was generally agreed by all humanists that Cicero had been the greatest Latin

prose stylist, no writer before the last decades of the fourteenth century recommended that his style be imitated. Scholars of the period were poorly prepared technically to undertake such an endeavor in any case. No tradition existed in the Middle Ages for teaching ancient prose as there did for poetry, and the free character of prose – it was *solutus* or unbound – made imitation of a particular style difficult. Nevertheless, we know from the few attempts that medieval writers were largely unequipped for generic imitation – most were uninterested in it.

A dawning awareness among Florentine scholars of the chronological development of ancient literature, together with a realization that ancient Latin itself had undergone historical change, encouraged imitation of Cicero.[1] Salutati's letter to Cardinal Oliari in 1395 doubtless reflected contemporary thinking in Salutati's intellectual circle.[2] His account in that letter of the history of Latin literature, beginning with the authors of Cicero's age as representatives of the heights of eloquence and tracing the declines and revivals of literary quality down to the Trecento, had already envisaged the history of Latin in terms of epochs. By the last years of Salutati's life, discussion appears to have moved forward from this focus on grouping individual styles into ages. The significance of such an awareness for contemporary Latin writing became a major issue of debate between Salutati and his disciples.

Toward his disciples Salutati was not merely an informal teacher but also a patron. As chancellor of Florence, he had always exercised an influence on appointments to notarial positions in the government, and as his stature grew abroad, his recommendations on behalf of young scholars seeking work outside the city came to carry more weight. In the last decades of his life he intervened repeatedly in favor of friends and colleagues seeking employment, as he did in the case of Malpaghini. In 1403, his support was probably instrumental in launching the young Poggio Bracciolini's career at the curia, and in 1405, letters from Salutati smoothed the way for Bruni's first appointment there as well.

[1] Because the four poets usually imitated, Virgil, Horace, Lucan, and Ovid, all wrote within less than a century of one another, linguistic differences between them were minimal. Consequently, the absence of a historical conception of development of the Latin language would not have seriously impeded the classicizing of poetry.

[2] See above, 325–26.

Salutati may have prized Bruni above his other disciples. It is certain that before leaving Florence Bruni did everything to please the aging chancellor, including helping him with Greek passages in Latin texts and translating St. Basil and Plato's *Phaedo* at his suggestion.[3] After they were at the curia, Salutati continued to follow both Poggio and Bruni with admonitions and even criticism. Lionized in Rome for their learning and beginning to gain promotions on their own merits, the young men came to resent his interference.

By the last months of 1405, Salutati had made Bruni so furious that the men seemed close to an open break. Two letters from Salutati were involved. The first reflected the elderly humanist's sense of fatherly responsibility toward his disciples. Salutati had apparently received word from Rome that Jacopo da Scarperia, a minor member of his Florentine circle, had first declined an appointment as papal *scriptor* and then, after it had been offered to Bruni, had reconsidered; Jacopo was now competing for it.[4] On August 11, the old man wrote a letter to Jacopo, criticizing his inconstancy, and for some reason sent it unsealed to Bruni, asking him to deliver it in person to the addressee. The report had apparently been false: Jacopo had never been considered, but it angered Bruni that Salutati would even have entertained the idea that he could have been second choice to Jacopo. In an outraged reply on August 15, Bruni refused to hand Jacopo the letter. As a way of wounding his former teacher, he went for a sensitive nerve, the quality of Salutati's Latinity.

> If you wish to write things properly, however, correct this part of the letter as well as the construction at the beginning, since it is incorrect and inelegant.[5]

His failure to specify his exact criticism led to a confused response months later from Salutati.

Bruni's letter of August 15 had not yet arrived in Florence when Salutati received a later one from Bruni, written on September 13, this time from Viterbo, where the curia had taken refuge from distur-

[3] This point is made by Riccardo Fubini, "All'uscita dalla Scolastica medievale: Salutati, Bruni, e i *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*," *Archivio storico italiano* 150 (1992): 1079–80.

[4] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:110–13.

[5] Francesco P. Luiso, *Studi su l'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*, ed. Lucia Gualdo Rosa, Studi storici, 122–24 (Rome, 1980), 7; and Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:112, n. 2 (continued from previous page). Bruni probably edited out this phrase in his own collection. In any case, it is not found in Mehus's edition: *Leonardi Bruni aretini epistolarum libri VIII*, ed. L. Mehus, 2 vols. (Florence, 1741), 1:6.

bances in Rome.[6] Bruni's bitter lament at the makeshift conditions under which he was forced to live during the temporary exile from Rome provoked a stinging criticism in a letter of November 6 from Salutati, dismayed at his young friend's lack of stamina.[7] In late November or early December, Bruni answered this attack on his character with a blistering assault on Salutati's manner of writing proper names in Latin. Anger had prompted Bruni to give overt expression to his longfelt sense of Salutati's inferior Latinity.

Bruni's letter of August 15, for some reason delayed, arrived about the same time as the one written in late November or early December, and Salutati assumed that the August letter's mention of a faulty construction in the opening passage was another criticism of his letter of November 6. Consequently, his response of January 9, 1406, not only defended his practice of writing proper names but also rebutted what he assumed to have been a criticism of the opening phrases of the November 6 letter. Focusing first on the latter, he admitted that his opening salutation did not correspond with the simpler one of antiquity (*si vales bene est, ego valeo*), but why should Bruni have been displeased?

> I have always thought that one ought to imitate antiquity so that the model not be simply a copy but so that something new always be introduced. You know that I am not ignorant of the habits of our most famous Cicero and I willingly use his words. But it is one thing to copy, another to imitate. Imitation has something belonging to the one imitating and is not completely taken from the one we imitate. Copying, on the other hand, expresses in his entirety the writer whom we are reproducing.[8]

---

[6] The letter is published by Ludwig Bertalot, *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, ed. Paul O. Kristeller, Storia e letteratura, 2 vols., nos. 129 and 130 (Rome, 1975), 2:417–18.

[7] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:113–20. In a letter to Niccoli in March 1406, Bruni complained that Salutati had responded to his plea for sympathy as Zeno of Sidon might have done (*Epistolarum*, 1:20).

[8] Salutati's salutation to Bruni reads: "Postquam ergo tibi per Dei gratiam bene est et michi bene est" (*Epist.*, 4:113). The Latin for the passage that I quote here reads: "Sed antiquitatem sic semper censui imitandam, quod pura non prodeat, sed aliquid semper secum afferat novitatis. Scis me non ignorare morem nostri celeberrimi Ciceronis, meque libenter verbis uti suis. Sed aliud est referre, aliud imitari. Habet aliquid imitantis proprium imitatio, nec totum est eius quem imitamur; relatio vero totum solet exprimere quem referimus" (ibid., 148). What Salutati means by his willingness to use Cicero's words is unclear. Is he referring in this passage only to lexical imitation? At least Salutati's variegated lexicon, drawing on diverse Latins, belies the realization of any such intention.

Therefore, Salutati stood by his salutation, which "does not entirely elude *vetustas* itself."

Apparently for the same reason and because there was nothing incorrect in the usage, Salutati did not hesitate to reject Bruni's criticism that he had been wrong in his letter of November 6 to use the patronymic in the nominative, *Leonardus Ceccus Aretinus*, instead of the ancient form, *Leonardus Cecchi filius* (Leonardo son of Cecco).[9] As for the current form of linking the individual with his place of origin, Salutati insisted on the correctness of *Leonardo de Aretio*, even if it did not follow the ancient practice, which would have *Leonardus aretinus.*[10] To Bruni's charge that Salutati's use of three names, *Linus Coluccius Salutatus*, had no foundation in ancient practice, he retorted that his real name was *Linus Coluccius.*[11] Realizing he had gone too far, Bruni pulled back in the next letter he wrote to Salutati in February 1406.[12] His olive branch took the form of an outrageous compliment that he knew would please his mentor: "I give you the palm of oratory before all others."[13]

While Bruni and Salutati's other Florentine disciples, like Salutati himself, would certainly have disavowed following any author slavishly, even Cicero, Salutati's claim to imitate antiquity while defending usages that he himself might recognize as more recent must have distressed them. The numerous occasions on which Salutati altered ancient practices unknowingly, moreover, must have rendered him pitiable in their eyes. In retrospect, Bruni would believe that it would have been more honorable simply to have tolerated Salutati's errors, rather than criticizing the old man who had been like a parent to him. What could Bruni reply to Salutati's exclamation:

---

[9] Ibid., 4:150–53.

[10] Ibid., 4:153–54.

[11] Bruni, *Epistolarum*, 2:173, and Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:149. Salutati explains that, although he had not used "Linus" for much of his life, he reassumed the name to avoid having in second place the name of his father, which in Latin would have been pretentious: *Coluccius Pierius Salutatus*. *Pierius*, from the patronymic *Pierides*, would by implication have associated him with the muses.

In a postscript to the letter, Salutati notes that he had misunderstood Bruni's reference in the earlier letter and now sees that it concerns his letter to Jacopo. Salutati can only think that, because he can find nothing erroneous in his copy, the scribe must have made a mistake, and he sends Bruni another copy of the beginning passage (ibid., 4:158).

[12] Bruni's letter to Salutati is found in Claudio Griggio, "Due lettere inedite del Bruni al Salutati e a Francesco Barbaro," *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 26 (1986): 47–48.

[13] Ibid., 47: "Ego tibi pre ceteris omnibus palmam oratorie artis attribuo."

> Nor ought you to try, if you will, to persuade me and yourself that I have had such useless commerce with the most praiseworthy authors of antiquity for more than fifty years without being able to understand their ways.[14]

Bruni and his cohort of Florentine humanists likely felt (but could not say) that, while Salutati's commerce with the ancients had not been useless, at least his understanding of antiquity was inferior to theirs.

In the last year of his life, Salutati's relationship with Poggio was worse. An exchange of letters between the two in the period from August 1405 to March 1406 reveals that Poggio and an unidentified Florentine "friend" of both men in Rome were being highly critical of Petrarch's Latin style because it lacked *vetustas*.[15] Poggio's attack on

---

[14] *Epist.*, 4:155.

[15] Salutati's two letters, written in August 1405 and March 1406, are found in Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:126–45 and 158–70. Poggio's first letter to Salutati, which initiated the controversy, was probably written in July or August 1405 (ibid., 4:127, n. 1); and his second letter sometime in the intervening months between Salutati's two responses. Both are lost, however; we have only the fragments that Salutati actually quotes from them.

Salutati's first letter to Poggio suggests that his correspondent's views are shared by another of Salutati's friends in Rome, who, learning of Salutati's high opinion of Petrarch, has "almost totally let him [Salutati] fall from his bosom" (ibid., 4:131). That the friend resides in Rome is suggested by Salutati's description of how the conversation on the subject arose between Poggio (certainly in Rome) and the friend: "[tu] asserens quod, cum [tu: Poggius] illum doctum hominem offendisses; inter loquendum in eum te devenisse sermonem ...." Because the friend has asserted his wish to end his friendship with Salutati, it is improbable that he is Bruni. Furthermore, the friend is Florentine (ibid., 4:161): "Non habuit inclyta nostra Florentia clariorem divino eloquentissimoque Petrarca, ut non debeas, tu vel alius, qui Florentinus sit, fame nostri civis vel leviter derogare." We know that the anonyomous critic must have been close to Salutati, because (1) hitherto he had thought highly of Salutati and (2) Salutati would like a letter from him (ibid., 4:144–45). But how could someone close to Salutati only now learn of the chancellor's high opinion of Petrarch?

Salutati's correspondence with Poggio shows that Salutati's relationship with Bruni as late as the spring of 1406 was still strained. Salutati concludes his letter of March 26, 1406, by asking Poggio to greet Bruni on his behalf (ibid., 4:169–70), but he does so ironically, by referring implicitly to his recent controversy with Bruni over the way to write the latter's name: "Vale, et Leonardum Aretinum, sic enim appellari vult, quasi non sit alius Aretii Leonardus, vel prenomen patris abhorreat, vice mea salute plurima prosequaris."

For other discussions of these letters, see M. Aurigemma, "I giudizi sul Petrarca e le idee letterarie di Coluccio Salutati," *Arcadia: Atti e memorie della Accademia letteraria italiana*, 3rd ser., 6 (1975–76): 67–145; my *Hercules*, 266–69 and 403–05; and Fubini, "All'uscita della scolastica medievale," 1065–99. Iiro Kajanto, *Poggio Bracciolini and Classicism: A Study in Early Italian Humanism* (Helsinki, 1987), uses this debate as the foundation for his study of Poggio's classicism.

Petrarch in the first letter extended to a general criticism of all modern writers for being so vastly inferior to the ancients that no comparison (or almost none) could be made between the two groups.[16] That was a direct assault on some of Salutati's earlier assessments of Petrarch as a writer. Confronted with Salutati's heated rebuttal in a letter of December 17, 1405, Poggio sarcastically pretended to mollify Salutati: if Salutati did not want to hear the truth, then he, Poggio, would only use flattery (4:160–61). He then offered a new assessment of Petrarch's work:

> I have always considered him a most eloquent man and the most learned. All who delight in our kind of studies owe him a good deal. Indeed he was the first who, by his labor, industry, and vigilance, restored to us those studies awaiting destruction and laid open the way for others wanting to follow. He wrote distinguished histories; composed a brilliant poem, communicated many things for guiding human life, and left behind invectives of singular eloquence; he knew all the writings in all areas of studies. I think, moreover, that he is to be compared with many ancient historians, poets, orators, and philosophers.[17]

Salutati responded by dismissing Poggio's encomium as insincere, adding that, even if honest, it fell short of doing justice to Petrarch's stature as a writer (4:162).

In responding to Poggio's charge that the ancients were incomparably superior to the moderns, Salutati asserted in both his letters, as he had in 1379, that Petrarch was second only to Cicero in prose and second only to Virgil in verse. Salutati did not now make Petrarch superior to both, as he had done in 1379, for surpassing Cicero in poetry and Virgil in prose. That plaudit had perhaps been Salutati's way of backtracking on his exaggerated praise of Petrarch in 1374, in the aftermath of Petrarch's death. Overall, in any case, Salutati's assessment of the achievement of modern writers now exceeded the one that he had made a decade earlier, an assessment that was doubtless well-known in Florence. Indeed, to judge from Salutati's rebuttal to Poggio's now lost letter, Poggio's denial that ancient and modern eloquence were comparable came close to matching Salutati's position in 1395.

---

[16] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:134: "quod dicas nullam vel admodum parvam comparationem fieri debere inter priscos illos eruditissimos viros et eos, qui nostris seculis claruerunt." Fubini, "All'uscita dalla scolastica medievale," 1077, shows that criticism of Petrarch's reputation had begun in northern Italy prior to Poggio.

[17] Salutati, ibid., 4:161. Salutati is quoting Poggio's words here.

Since Salutati was now convinced that only a Christian could be truly eloquent, he weighed the quality of eloquence in 1405–06 differently than he had in 1395. Responding on December 17, 1405, to Poggio's first letter criticizing modern writers, Salutati replied that he was in complete agreement if by "ancient" Poggio meant the style of Church Fathers such as Jerome, Ambrose, and especially Augustine.[18] If, however, Poggio intended the pagan writers, then he must realize that learning involved two goals, eloquence and wisdom. When that was taken into account,

> not only Petrarch but even the most poorly educated person of our time excels the Gentiles: Cicero, Varro, and all the Romans; Aristotle, Plato, and the Greeks.[19]

Doubtless the ancients were superior to the moderns in their command of the liberal arts, including rhetoric, but they erred seriously in natural philosophy, metaphysics, and above all in theology.[20] Socrates, aware of the difficulty of achieving knowledge in such subjects, redirected the attention of thinkers to ethics, but even there, antiquity failed because it remained ignorant of the proper end of moral action. Genuine eloquence served truth, and that was possible only within a Christian context.

For Salutati, the areas of learning appropriate for eloquence in the modern age were preaching, teaching, and disputation, all three of which were directed to advancing Christian truth. Even Poggio would not find fault with eloquence "in preaching the word of God, in the instruction of doctrines, or in the subtleties of disputation."[21] The epitome of the modern orator was Luigi Marsili, a Parisian-trained theologian who, excelling in every branch of knowledge, expressed himself eloquently in preaching, teaching, and debate.

From what little survives of Marsili's writings – he seems in fact to have written almost nothing – and from the paucity of biographical information remaining, it would seem that in praising Marsili Salutati was not by implication extolling the styles and methods of

---

[18] Ibid., 4:131–32.

[19] Ibid., 4:134–35.

[20] Ibid., 4:137–38: "Naturalem autem et metaphysicen et, que transcendit omnia, theologiam, nullo modo comprehendere vixque attingere potuerunt."

[21] Ibid., 4:139: "Non credo tamen quod in predicatione verbi Dei, in doctrinarum traditionibus vel disputationum argutiis aliquod eloquentie desiderandum putes ...." See Fubini, "All'uscita dalla scolastica medievale," 1081–82.

scholastic theologians.[22] Learned in the ancient writers, Marsili might better be characterized as a pious Christian thinker in the vein of Petrarch. Had he been the traditional scholastic, he would hardly have attracted such young disciples as Roberto Rossi or Niccolò Niccoli, the *arbiter elegantissimus* of early-fifteenth-century Florentine intellectuals.[23] Nonetheless, the three fields that Salutati mentioned as fit for eloquence formed a set traditionally understood to fall within the purview of theologians. More important, by identifying Marsili as the ideal modern orator, Salutati emphasized the link between eloquence and the articulation of Christian truth.

Poggio was aware of the dangers of responding directly to this series of arguments linking eloquence with religious truth, so in his second letter he simply ignored them and took the mocking stance described above. Discerning Poggio's strategy, Salutati used his second letter to rehearse the first letter's argument that eloquence depended on truth, while taunting the younger man to prove his negative assessment of Petrarch by attacking Salutati's position.[24] If Poggio had truth on his side, Salutati and others would believe him.

Salutati's strategy in the December letter, however, had involved not only tying linguistic excellence to knowledge of the truth, but also elaborating a theory of the historical development of language that would justify Petrarch's not having written in the ancient manner. On the basis of Cicero's observation in the *De orat.*, I.3.12, that oratory was "concerned in a way with the common practice, custom, and speech of men," Salutati argued that eloquence in each age was determined by the general linguistic practices of that age. He then proceeded to argue that changes in the Latin language from Ennius onward demonstrated that a particular author's style was merely a refined form of the language as it was spoken in the streets. If, as

[22] The basic biography of Marsili is found in R. Arbesmann, "Der Augustineremitenorden und der Beginn der humanistischen Bewegung," *Augustiniana* 14 (1964): 250-314, and 15 (1965): 259–93. See also Ugo Mariani, *Il Petrarca e gli Agostiniani* (Rome, 1946), 66–96. For the writings of Marsili, see D. Gutiérrez, "La biblioteca di Santo Spirito in Firenze," *Analecta augustiniana* 25 (1962): 5–88. For the correspondence between Salutati and Marsili, see Agostino Sottili, "Postille all'epistolario di Coluccio Salutati," *Romanische Forschungen* 79 (1967): 585–86.

[23] Cornelia Casari, *Notizie intorno a Luigi Marsili* (Lovere, 1900), 70–71.

[24] Salutati, *Epist.*, 4:165: "Vellem autem facilitatem illam tuam videre, qua refelleres eorum que scripsimus fundamenta." This concludes an extensive attack on the ancients' failure to understand truth and their resultingly imperfect moral lives.

Poggio and his friend maintained, modern writers (presumably Salutati included himself here) were inferior to ancient ones because they lacked *vetustas*, the moderns were being criticized for not being "guilty of the greatest vice that Cicero ascribes to those abandoning the popular kind of speech."

Salutati brought in this historical–linguistic argument as a secondary line of defense for Petrarch's reputation, one that reinforced his own Christian interpretation of eloquence. Tying eloquence to the linguistic exigencies of the age could, if taken to the limit, have made any comparison of Petrarch with the ancients impossible, nullifying Salutati's own thesis on Petrarch's relative status as a writer.[25] Salutati's main intent, though, was to undercut Poggio's position, which, while denying comparability, did so on the basis of the inferiority of the moderns.

Salutati's observations on the nature of language were to enjoy a distinguished future. On the same grounds, Valla would ultimately come to the diametrically opposed conclusion that just because there was no popular Latin speech in contemporary Europe on which to base one's style, writers and orators ought to choose as their model the Latin of the age when the language was at the height of its expression. Already in Florence in the early years of the fifteenth century, however, young humanists were embracing the distinction between style and language and were endeavoring to differentiate chronologically between linguistic layers in ancient Latin. Roughly in 1405, Cino Rinuccini (d. 1417), the rhetorician and vernacular poet, defended Trecento humanism by writing an attack on the young humanists of the city who were apparently openly disparaging Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. He criticized the young humanists because

> in order to appear well-read to the mob, they shout about the piazza how many diphthongs the ancients had and why today only two are in use; and which grammar is better, that of the time of the comic Terence or the polished one of the heroic Virgil.[26]

[25] In a sense, Salutati is restating his position of 1395 that no comparison can be made between modern and ancient writers; whereas then, however, he meant to stress the gross inferiority of the moderns, a decade later the incommensurability rests on the need for modern eloquence to meet the standards of its own day.

[26] "Invettiva contro a cierti calunniatori di Dante e di messer Francesco Petrarcha e di messer Giovanni Bocaccio, i nomi de' quali per onestà si tacciono," ed. A. Lanza, in *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Quattrocentro: Storia e testi* (Rome, 1972), 262: "per parere litteratissimi apresso al vulgo, gridano a piaza quanti dittonghi avevano gli antichi e perchè oggi non se ne usano se non due; e qual

Notice that Cino was deriding the younger humanists not simply for wrangling over whether Terence or Virgil had the better style but over whether the grammar of the time of the one was better than the grammar of the time of the other. Here we may glimpse how the development of a historical appraisal of Latin literature could lead to a historical appraisal of the language in which that literature was written, a feature that distinguishes what I have called the first Ciceronianism.

The young men whom Cino attacked were trying to decide at which stage ancient Latin reached its zenith. The array of tensions between Salutati and his younger colleagues, reflected in their epistolary exchanges, became channeled into the debate around the issue of whether a "classical" Latin existed. If the greatest period of eloquence was the first century B.C.E. and the modern age was incomparably inferior, Petrarch's eclectic approach to style would be discredited. The philological effort to define the syntax and lexicon of the age of Cicero was under way. The material for such a study stood at hand. Most of the surviving orations of Cicero were available, eleven of which had been exhaustively analyzed by Loschi, although the latter's collection of memorable quotations was only a first step toward understanding the master's style. At the same time, the remains of Cicero's correspondence surviving from ancient times were mostly identified and ready for stylistic examination.

While the interest in regaining *vetustas* began with the emphasis on Cicero's works, basically the letters and orations, it is important to emphasize again that the first Ciceronianism was not focused, as the second would be, on maintaining a slavish loyalty to Cicero to the extent that lexicon, syntax, and construction were hostages to Cicero's usages. A thorough understanding of all aspects of Ciceronian style lay decades in the future. But Bruni's generation had no such goal in mind: while following Cicero, they were concerned to keep a distance.

---

gramatica sia migliore, o quella del tempo del comico Terrenzio o dell'eroico Vergilio ripulita ...." For my dating of the work in 1405/06, see my *Hercules*, 270. James Hankins's establishment of the date for the completion of the *Laudatio Florentinae urbis* as summer 1404 (see next note) makes a date of 1405 for the "Invettiva" probable. Once the *Laudatio* was in circulation, Rinuccini's criticism of the younger humanist group would no longer have been valid. By the same token, it seems appropriate to situate the work in the period when Salutati's disciples were beginning to snipe openly at his Latin, that is, 1405/06.

2

Proof of the new generation's talent for a more classicizing style and of the new level of locutionary energy that it provided was Bruni's *Laudatio Florentinae urbis*, composed in the summer of 1404.[27] Inevitably a point of reference in discussions of stylistic approaches within Salutati's circle, the achievement could not have failed to fuel the tension between Salutati and his disciples in the remaining two years of his life. The contrast between Salutati's *Invectiva contra Antonium Luschum*, composed in oratorical form in 1403, and the *Laudatio*, written the following year, points to a sea change in the conception of *imitatio* between the two generations.

Compare a portion of the opening period of Salutati's *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum vicentinum* with the Bruni passage:

> Fuit nuper per quosdam insignes, et venerabiles viros mihi transmissum invectivae cuiusdam exemplum, quod sumptum ab exemplari verissimo carissimi fratris mei Antonii Luschi vicentini certissime dicebatur, quam aiebant, ut res ipsa docet, eum contra nomen, et gloriam Florentinorum, immo certissimum asserebant, impetu quodam mentis, et voluntatis mordaciter dictavisse ....[28]

Note three points. (1) The sentence structure is essentially paratactic, with the run-on clauses beginning *quod* and *quam*. (2) While the coupling of nouns (*nomen ... gloriam* and *mentis et voluntatis*) and of adjectives (*insignes* and *venerabiles*) reflects an effort to give balance, the flow of the sentence is needlessly broken by the position of *immo ... asserebant*. (3) Salutati uses four superlatives, making his period too gushy for classical standards.[29]

---

[27] Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, 1966), 12–24, was the first to criticize the hitherto accepted dating of the *Laudatio* to 1401. Baron argued that the work should be dated as 1403/04. James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Leiden and New York, 1991), 2:371, has proven conclusively that the work was composed in the summer of 1404. For further bibliography on Baron, see n. 60, below.

[28] Salutati, *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum vicentinum*, ed. D. Moreni (Florence, 1826), 1.

[29] Among modern scholars of Renaissance Latin style, Eduoard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa vom 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 4th ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin, 1923), 2:763–72, treats humanist classicizing without discussing its chronological development, whereas for T. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, 2nd. ed. (Leipzig and Berlin, 1908), 224, Bruni is "die erste korrekte Neulateiner."

The revolutionary character of Bruni's style becomes clear from the opening lines of his praise of Florence in the *Laudatio*:

> Vellem michi a deo immortali datum esset ut vel Florentini urbi, de qua dicturus sum, parem eloquentiam prestare possem, vel certe meo erga illam studio meeque voluntati. Alterutrum enim, ut opinor, abunde esset ad illius magnificentiam nitoremque ostendendum. Nam et ipsa urbs eiusmodi est ut nichil neque luculentius neque splendidius in toto orbe terrarum inveniri possit, et voluntas quidem mea, ut ego de me ipso facile intelligo, nulla in re unquam fuit ardentior: ut nullo modo dubitem, si quodvis illorum adesset, me de hac precellenti et formosissima urbe cum elegantia et dignitate verba facere posse. Verum quia non omnia que volumus eadem nobis et posse concessum est, quantum poterimus id in medium afferemus, ut non voluntas nobis sed facultas potius videatur defuisse.[30]

This opening passage startles by its clarity and the impression of Attic simplicity that it achieves despite the complexity of its periodic structure. Vital to the articulate expression are the purity of its lexicon and the use of verbs that stand as pillars ordering the arrangement of *membra* and insuring the logical cohesiveness of the whole. A variation of the topos of humility traditional in prefaces, the elegant introduction left no doubt that the author, despite his customary bow to modesty, was equal to the task that he had set for himself. To this point in our study, no example of prose compares with this architectonically structured text.

---

[30] "Bruni's *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*: First Printed Edition," ed. Hans Baron, in his *From Petrarch to Bruni: Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature* (Chicago and London, 1968), 232–63. The cited passage is on 232. V. Zaccaria has published another edition in "Pier Candido Decembrio e Leonardo Bruni (notizie dell'epistolario del Decembrio)," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 8 (1967): 529–54. An English translation is found in B.G. Kohl and R.G. Witt, *The Earthly Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society* (Philadelphia, 1978), 135–75. The translation of the passage in the text is found in ibid., 135, here with some emendations: "I would wish that God immortal might grant that I be able to show eloquence equal to the city of Florence, about which I am to speak, or at least equal to my zeal and wish on its behalf; for either one degree or the other would, I think, abundantly demonstrate the city's magnificence and splendor. Florence is of such a nature that a more distinguished or more splendid city is not able to be found on the entire earth, and I can easily say about myself, I never felt more ardently the wish to do anything in my life. So I have no doubt at all that if either of these wishes were granted, I should be able to describe with elegance and dignity this most beautiful and excellent city. But because everything we want and the ability granted us to attain what we wish are two different things, we will set our description before the public as well as we can, so that we may appear lacking in talent rather than in wish."

Bruni began the *Laudatio* by asking God for a degree of eloquence equal to the greatness of the city or at least to his desire to praise it. Throughout the first period, he depended for rhythm on short parallel passages in the purpose clauses. The main clause, *ut ... parem eloquentiam prestare possem*, motivated by *Vellem ... esset*, is set between two parallel and alternative dative phrases, the first, *vel Florentino urbi*, combined with its dependent clause *de qua ... sum*, and the second, a double dative formed by hendiadys, *vel ... studio ... voluntati*, whose slightly greater length weights the line and provides closure. The alliterative use of *p* in the main section of the purpose clause, moreover, accentuates its centrality to the sense of the whole period.

After a short paratactic second period affirming that either level of eloquence would suffice for a panegyric on the city, the third period, again complex, assures the listener that the level must be high, given the greatness of the city and the intensity of Bruni's desire to praise it. The expression of the thought, enriched as it proceeds with a diversity of nuances, only becomes fully realized with the sealing of the whole complex by the final infinitive. Introducing the period with *nam*, Bruni distinguishes the alternate sources of inspiration for the task of lauding Florence, *ipsa urbs* and *voluntas mea.* The first clause of the period is a result clause motivated by the quantifier *eiusmodi est*, while the second clause, *et voluntas quidem mea ...*, with its dependent clause *ut ... intelligo*, assumes the parallel position. A second result clause dependent on the first two clauses begins with *ut nullo modo dubitem*, where *nullo modo* is reinforced by *nulla in re*, echoing from the preceding clause. A short adverbial clause, containing the proviso *si quodvis illorum adesset*, interrupts to condition the confident *nullo modo dubitem* and the statement in the indirect discourse which follows. The final period affirms Bruni's intention to do the best he can in praising the city.

The binomial character of the paragraph, constructed for most of its length by the juxtaposition of *urbs* and *voluntas*, extends to repeated coupling of two adjectives or two nouns. The use of *studio ... voluntati*, in the last clause of the first period, lending dignity to the diction by slowing the pace of the line, is matched with a similar elegant effect in the short period following, with *magnificentiam nitoremque*. The technique reappears again in the third period: *neque luculentius neque splendidius*, *precellenti et formosissima*, and *elegantia et dignitate.* In the fourth, the binomialism takes the form of the contrast *voluntas* and *facultas* in the result clause, echoing the tension between wish (*volumus*)

and ability (*potuerimus*) expressed in the two previous clauses, on which the result clause depends. A more general binomialism resides in the continuing tension between wish (*voluntas*, that is, *vellem*, *voluntati*, *voluntas*, *quodvis*, *volumus*, and *voluntas*) and ability (*posse*, that is, *possem*, *possit*, *posse*, *posse*, *poterimus*), and perhaps Bruni remembered that *potius* came from the same root as *posse*.

Beginning with a plea to God, Bruni maintains throughout the paragraph and the rest of the work the fiction that the work is to be delivered orally. The interweaving of clearly distinguished, balanced clausal sequences articulate for the ear the tightly ordered development of ideas. Even the frequent adverbial clauses are so appositely set that the richer texturing they provide for the argument is easily apprehended by a listener or reader. Although no allusions to specific Ciceronian subtexts are detectable here, Ciceronian oratorical prose unmistakably provides the generic model for the passage, as for the *Laudatio* as a whole.[31]

The pioneering character of this first of Bruni's prose writings was not restricted to stylistic innovations but extended to the content of the work. A comparison of Vergerio's roughly contemporary praise of Venice illustrates the revolutionary character of Bruni's approach to the traditional *laudes urbis* theme.[32] Surviving in substantial but fragmentary form – it was probably never completed – Vergerio's panegyric dutifully proceeded through the standard categories common to the genre: geographic setting, character of the population, nature of the city's economic life, and so on. The only novel aspect of

[31] I do not want to give the impression that Bruni maintains the same high quality of diction throughout the work; that of his *In funere Nanni Strozae equitis florentini*, written twenty years later, shows greater consistency in classicizing. *In funere* is published by Susanne Daub, *Leonardo Brunis Rede auf Nanni Strozzi: Einleitung, Edition, und Kommentar* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1996). On Bruni's style generally, see Remigio Sabbadini's brief analysis in *Storia del ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della Rinascenza* (Turin, 1885), 12–13. See also E. Santini, "La produzione volgare di Leonardo Bruni aretino e il suo culto per 'le tre corone fiorentine,'" *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 60 (1912): 302–07. Santini writes (302): "Se non che s'egli potè riconoscere ne'classici quel bello che anche oggi noi, forniti di copiosi mezzi sussidiari, gustiamo, e se potè proporsi di avvicinarsi a essi, negli scritti rimase assai lontano dal conseguire l'ideale di perfezione che vagheggiava. Nelle traduzione, e più nelle opere oratorie a guisa della *Laudatio*, si sente chiaramente lo sforzo per ottenere purezza di lingua ed elegante collocazione di parole."

[32] The Latin text is found in D. Robey and J. Law, "The Venetian Myth and the *De republica veneta* of Pier Paolo Vergerio," *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 15 (1975): 3–59. My English translation of a portion of the work is in *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*, ed. Jill Kraye, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1997), 2:117–27.

the work was an extensive treatment of Venice's governmental structure, involving a definition of the various public offices and their specific functions. Even here, though, the discussion never rose above a pedestrian level of detail. Redeemed occasionally by vivid descriptions of the islands and lagoons surrounding the city, testimonies to Vergerio's affection for *ekphrasis*, the surviving segments offer no indication that he had any appreciation of the historical significance of the great maritime republic or of the relevance of its constitutional experience for political thought.

By contrast, the descriptive sections of Bruni's composition were motivated by and integrated into a broad conceptual framework aimed at demonstrating the unique role that Florence had played in the historic defense of republican liberty. After the brief apology for his inadequacies before the great task, Bruni praised Florence's location midway between two large bodies of water and its moderate and salubrious climate. Then came an *ekphrasis* describing the walled city as a circular shield, with the *Palazzo della Signoria*, the seat of Florentine government, as the boss, and the suburbs and countryside beyond extending out to the borders of Florentine territory in successive rings, like rings on the shield's surface.

Next came a discussion of the origins of the Florentine people, which Bruni used to define the city's political allegiance and to suggest a causal link between the outstanding attributes of the city that he had already mentioned on the one hand and its republican identity on the other. Founded by ancient Romans in the Republican period, before the emperors could sap the city's strength and corrupt Roman blood by their tyrannical excesses, Florence inherited the Republic's "dominion over the entire world." Thanks to their noble descent, Florentines enjoyed the hereditary right to exercise arms over the whole earth, justifying all of Florence's efforts to defend or recover former Roman lands. Bruni concluded this extensive passage with a vivid and impassioned depiction of the vicious reigns of a succession of emperors. He was even prepared to condemn Julius Caesar for "manifest crimes ... visited upon the city of Rome!" Although confessing himself unable to deny that great virtues mingled with vices in Caesar's character and that Augustus, his adopted son, retained at least "vestiges of certain virtues that made his faults more tolerable," Bruni nevertheless apostrophized Caesar:

> I cannot forget, nor do I think that I should not be angry, that you paved the way for so many evils and outrages that your successors perpetrated with every kind of iniquity and cruelty.[33]

Bruni finished the indictment of the emperors by citing from memory the testimony of Cornelius Tacitus to the effect that with the coming of the emperors, "those outstanding minds vanished."[34] Bruni concluded the discussion of the origins of Florence by summarizing what he had said so far:

> Since Florence had as its founders those who were obeyed everywhere by everyone and dominated by their skill and military prowess, and since it was founded when a free and unconquered Roman people flourished in power, nobility, virtues, and genius, it cannot be doubted at all that this one city not only stands out in its beauty, architecture, and appropriateness of site (as we have seen), but that Florence also greatly excels all other cities in the dignity and nobility of its origin.[35]

Salutati must have been generally pleased with the integrated interpretation of Florence's origins and the presentation of its current condition, but having less than four years before specifically defined Caesar's rule as monarchical and legitimate, he may have taken umbrage at Bruni's attack on Caesar as the founder of Roman imperial tyranny. All the same, despite the *De tyranno*'s categorical affirmation of Caesar's legitimacy, privately Salutati seems not to have been so sure.[36]

Unwilling to rest content with their inherited status, Bruni continued, the Florentines had demonstrated their Roman nobility through the exercise of every kind of virtue. Their liberality had made Florence a haven for exiles from all over Italy, and the city had ever endeavored to protect neighboring states from tyranny and internal dissension. Florence's integrity and its scrupulous observance of agreements were universally recognized even by its enemies, who also

---

[33] Bruni, *Laudatio*, 247.

[34] As Baron points out (*Crisis*, 475, n. 20), Bruni must be quoting Tacitus from memory when he cites the Roman writer as saying "praeclara illa ingenia ... abiere." The actual passage from the *Historiae*, 1.1, reads: "magna illa ingenia cessare."

[35] Bruni, *Laudatio*, 248: "Nunc vero, cum Florentia eiusmodi habeat auctores, quibus omnia que ubique sunt virtute atque armis domita paruerint, et cum eo tempore deducta sit quo populus Romanus liber atque incolumis potentia, nobilitate, virtute, ingeniis maxime florebat, a nullo profecto dubitari potest, quin hec una urbs non solum pulcritudine et ornatu et opportunitate loci, ut videmus, sed etiam dignitate et nobilitate generis plurimum prestet."

[36] In a private letter of 1405 (*Hercules*, 386).

knew and feared the highmindedness and courage of its people. Among the examples that he chose to demonstrate Florence's military accomplishments, Bruni gave pride of place to Florence's recent frustration of the designs of Giangaleazzo Visconti, who after attaining domination over most of northern and much of central Italy, failed to conquer Florence, the last bulwark of republican freedom.[37]

Parallel to Florence's splendid role in foreign affairs, the city enjoyed a constitution embodying in laws and institutions the principles of liberty and justice "without which this great people would not even consider life worth living."[38] Well-defined public offices, magistracies, tribunals, and social groups worked together to achieve a harmonious, free, and just society. Although the chief executive college, the *Signoria*, exercised a kind of kingly power (*vim regie potestatis*), its authority was limited by its two-month term of office, its association with two other councils, the *Duodecem viri boni* and the *Iuventutis signifieri*, and by the councils of the People and of the Commune. Justice was dispensed by foreign officials, each guild had its own organization to settle internal disputes, and a myriad of minor magistracies exercised specific functions for the public good. Finally, the *Parte guelfa* played a role similar to that of the censors at Rome, the Areopagites at Athens, and the ephors of Sparta: elected from among the Florentine people, the leaders of the *Parte* were charged with insuring that the city never rejected the "sound policies established by its forebears."

No place on earth could provide greater justice to all classes, offering equal treatment before the law. Penalties were in fact greater for the rich than for the poor:

> It is consonant with reason that as the status of men is different, so their penalties ought to be different. The city has judged it consistent with its ideals of justice and prudence that those who have the most need should also be helped the most. Therefore, the different classes are treated

[37] Although Giangaleazzo actually died of plague in the first days of September 1402, before an attack on Florence could be launched, Bruni, referring to the collapsing Milanese empire, implies that it was Florence's doing (*Laudatio*, 258): "Sic igitur hec civitas animata cum potentissimo et opulentissimo hoste ita summa virtute congressa est, ut, qui paulo ante toti Italie imminebat nec quenquam sibi resistere posse arbitabatur, eum et pacem optare et intra Ticini menia trepidare coegerit ...."

In fact, Florence was not completely isolated in that it still had Padua as an ally. Benjamin Kohl, *Padua Under the Carrara: 1318–1405* (Baltimore and London, 1998), 320–26, recounts events in 1402 leading up to the duke's death, from the Paduan perspective.

[38] Bruni, *Laudatio*, 259.

> according to a certain fairness (*equabilitas*); the upper class is protected by its wealth, the lower class by the state, and fear of punishment defends both.[39]

Furthermore, Florence extended the same treatment to all, whether citizens or foreigners.

In stressing the city's constitutional impediments to domination by one person or group of people and the fair administration of the law for all Florentine citizens, Bruni evinced a concern closely identified with Cicero. In using *equabilitas*, he invoked a unique Ciceronian word, which in the Ciceronian texts known to him, *De oratore* and *De officiis*, meant fairness or impartiality. He could not have known that in the *De re publica* Cicero used the word in a negative sense, to refer to an undesirable political equality. Bruni probably used the word synonymously with *equitas*, which Cicero used to refer to the governing principle underlying the legal system of the Roman Republic.[40]

In his closing remarks, after lauding Florentines for enjoying leadership in every area of human endeavor, Bruni turned briefly to consider the status of literature and language in the city. Surprisingly, however, he devoted only a brief paragraph to a subject which, given Florence's claim to the *Tre Corone* and to providing a vernacular tongue well on its way to becoming the literary language of Italy, would seem to have offered an occasion for amplified boasting. The final lines of the *Laudatio*, an invocation to God, Mary, and John the Baptist, patron saint of Florence, to protect the city, recall the only other religious aspect of the treatise, the initial commonplace appeal for God to grant Bruni eloquence for his task.

A comparison of the contents of the *Laudatio* with the Greek model

---

[39] "Rationi quippe consentaneum arbitrata est ut disparem condicionem hominum dispar pena sequeretur, et qui magis indigebat ei plus auxilii tribuere sue prudentie iustitieque putavit. Itaque ex diversis ordinibus facta est quedam equabilitas, cum maiores sua potentia, minores res publica, utrosque vero metus pene defendat" (*Laudatio*, 262).

[40] In classical Latin, the term *aequabilitas* only occurs in Cicero. In *De oratore*, I.42.188, Cicero writes: "Sit ergo in iure civili finis hic, legitimae atque usitatae in rebus causisque civium aequabilitatis conservatio." Similarly in II.84.345: "Et quoniam singularum virtutum sunt certa quaedam officia ac munera et sua cuique virtuti laus propria debetur, erit explicandum in laude iustitiae quid cum fide, quid cum aequabilitate, quid cum eiusmodi aliquo officio is qui laudabitur fecerit ...." In contrast, in his *De re publica*, I.43, he says that "aequabilitas est iniqua, cum habet nullos gradus dignitatis." Cf. also *De re pub.*, I.69. See J.P.V.D. Balsdon, "*Auctoritas, Dignitas, Otium*," *Classical Quarterly*, n.s., 10 (1960), 43–50; and Neal Wood, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988), 148–50.

that Bruni followed, the *Panathenaic Oration* of Aristides, written about 155 C.E., reveals the extent to which the thirty-four-year-old Bruni drew upon this eulogy of Athens to articulate his own thoughts.[41] While it is not difficult to find extensive parallel use of rubrics for discussion in the two works and even passages of Aristides that Bruni has translated *ad sententiam*, the two authors had somewhat different concerns.[42] Aristides cast a retrospective glance over Attic history and culture from its mythological origins to his own day. The author, a citizen of the ancient Athenian colony of Smyrna, located the primary source of Athenian grandeur in the autochthonous character of its people: mankind originated in Attica, and Athenians alone of all peoples had never been foreigners in their place of residence.[43] Not only were Athenians responsible for the development of civilization, but historically they played the role of defenders of Greek culture against the barbarians.[44] Bruni similarly used a biological theory to explain the republican character of Florentines, but he had almost nothing to say about the cultural life of Florence. That theme only became important in his analysis of Florentine greatness in his subsequent writings.

Just as Bruni discussed the Florentine constitution in the *Laudatio*,

[41] *Panathenaicus Oration and Defense of Oratory*, vol. 1 of *Aristides in Four Volumes*, ed. C. A. Behr (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 6–275. For Bruni's training in Greek and his early work as a translator, see Hankins, *Plato in the Renaissance*, 1:29–58. Bruni acknowledges his imitation of Aristides in *Epist.* VIII, 11.2.111. Hans Baron views the dependence of Bruni on Aristides in a positive light (*Crisis*, 192–95; and his "Imitation, Rhetoric, and Quattrocento Thought in Bruni's *Laudatio*," in *From Petrarch to Bruni*, 155–69). The close comparison between the *Laudatio* and the *Panathenaicus* made by Antonio Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited: A Reassessment of Hans Baron's Thesis on the Influence of the Classics in the *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*," in *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society: Essays Presented to J.R. Lander*, ed. J.K. Rowe (Toronto and London, 1986), 25–51, elucidates the extent of Bruni's dependence on Aristides.

It would have been difficult to compose such a novel encomium to Florence at an earlier date in that humanists lacked knowledge of Greek and Aristides' composition had no parallel in ancient Latin literature. Nor could it have developed easily out of the medieval Latin tradition of the *laudes urbis*, which, although insisting on rich detail, often statistical, in its listing of merits, manifested no sense of the organic character that a city's life derived from its history or its institutions (*Crisis*, 196–98). Likely Bruni, who began the study of Greek only in 1397, would not have been able to read Aristides' text much before 1400, three or four years before he undertook to use it for imitation.

[42] See examples in Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 29.

[43] *Panathenaicus*, 24–30: 26–29.

[44] Ibid., 92–213: 72–163.

so Aristides discussed the Athenian constitution toward the end of his work. Having described the chronological development of Athenian government from monarchy to democracy to aristocracy, Aristides simply employed the results to argue that all forms of government first originated in his city.[45] Unlike Bruni, Aristides did not identify one constitution as distinctively Athenian. He lauded Athens for privileging people of merit when distributing honors and offices, whereas Bruni emphasized equal justice before the law as the distinctive trait of Florentine public life.[46] Finally, Bruni's stress on the balance of power afforded by Florence's constitution provided an original focus and occupied a role in his work's development out of all proportion to Aristides' discussion of constitutions.[47]

A stylistic analysis of the passage in which Bruni expounded the virtues of the Florentine constitution indicates how Ciceronianism had a direct effect on Bruni's thinking. Bruni's concern with Ciceronian periodic construction not only allowed him to articulate his description of the Florentine constitution with clarity and vigor, but led him to envisage the constitution in a new way. The Florentine constitution became for him something of an analogue of the periodic sentence itself and, as such, an object of aesthetic value. Like the elegant period, the Florentine constitution enjoyed order and harmony with proper balance among all parts, even though each had its distinct identity.

> Nusquam tantus *ordo* rerum, nusquam tanta *elegantia*, nusquam tanta *concinnitas*... [A stringed instrument with the strings playing in harmony serves as a metaphor for the constitution]. Nichil est in ea *preposterum*, nichil *inconveniens*, nichil *absurdum*, nichil *vagum*; *suum queque locum tenent*, non modo *certum*, sed etiam *congruentem*: *distincta* officia, *distincti* magistratus, *distincta* iudicia, *distincti* ordines.[48]

---

[45] Ibid., 387–93: 264–71; and Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 43.

[46] Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 42–43, overlooks this contrast in his excellent article, to which I have an obvious debt.

[47] In *Crisis*, 194–95, and "Imitation, Rhetoric, and Quattrocento Thought," 156–57, Baron incorrectly interprets Aristides as praising Athens for having saved Greek civic freedom (*Crisis*, 337 and 416–17). Aristides claims, rather, that Athens defended Greek culture against the barbarians. By the same token, Baron tends to exaggerate Bruni's interest in Florence's cultural role in Italy (*Crisis*, 337 and 416–17; "Imitation, Rhetoric, and Quattrocento Thought," 164–66). Cf. the critique of Baron by Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 40–41.

[48] Bruni, *Laudatio*, 258–59; Kohl and Witt, *The Earthly Republic*, 168–69, with minor emendations: "Nowhere else do you find such internal order, such elegance, and such harmony .... There is nothing here that is ill-proportioned, nothing improper,

Like the *membra distincta* of the Ciceronian period, the three divisions of the Florentine government, executive, judicial, and legislative (the last consisting of the Council of the Commune and the Council of the People), combined in their operations to create political and social order, elegance, and harmony. In a Latin akin to Cicero's, Bruni provided a definition of the Florentine constitution that met aesthetic and functional criteria analogous to those set for the construction of the Ciceronian period itself. Mastery of the periodic sentence had heuristic consequences, leading Bruni to reinterpret the political structure of Florence in light of an aesthetic and functional ideal.

In every extensive section where Bruni adopted the elements of Aristides' conception and imagery, he sharpened and vivified the original.[49] It is too much to describe Bruni's depiction of Florentine territory in terms of concentric circles receding from the city, as Baron does, as "the first attempt ... to discover the secret laws of optics and perspective."[50] But unquestionably Bruni streamlined Aristides' cluttered representation of Athens as the center of the Greek world and created a verbal analogue to the visual perspective found in visual arts a few decades later.

Bruni's initial attraction to the use of *ekphrasis* may have been inspired by the *Ad Herennium*, as was Vergerio's, but in Bruni's case the interest was doubtless reinforced by Chrysoloras, who had probably introduced Bruni to Aristides. Aristides' awkward depiction of Athens as the geographical center of the world likely served as Bruni's primary inspiration for his perspectival description of Florence and its territory, but Bruni also had texts available to him in the humanist tradition itself that could have suggested such an approach.[51] Both Petrarch and Salutati, who themselves had little interest in the oratorical genre with which *ekphrasis* was identified as a rhetorical color, had written such perspectival descriptions.

Partly motivated by Philip of Macedon's ascent of Mt. Olympus, Petrarch wrote that he ascended Mount Ventoux, from whose sum-

---

nothing incongruous, nothing vague; everything occupies its proper place, which is not only clearly defined but also in right relation to all the other elements: distinct magistracies, distinct tribunals, and distinct social groups."

[49] Contrast the passages from the two authors in Santossuoso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 30–33.

[50] Baron, *Crisis*, 200.

[51] For Aristides' imagery, see Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 30–31.

mit, whether from memory or imagination, he provided a detailed description of the view in all directions reaching to the horizon.

> And suddenly what I had heard and read about Athos and Olympus became less incredible to me when I looked out from this mountain of lesser fame. I then directed my sight toward Italy, where my heart always inclines. The Alps themselves, frozen and snow-covered ..., seemed very close to me, although separated by a great distance .... I turned to look behind me toward the west. The boundary between Gaul and Spain, the Pyrenees, cannot be seen from there, not because anything intervenes as far as I know, but because the human sight is too weak. The mountains of the province of Lyons, however, could be seen very clearly to the right, and to the left the sea at Marseilles and at the distance of several days the one that beats upon Aigues-Mortes. The Rhone itself was beneath my eyes. [52]

Bruni could also have found a precedent for his description of Florence in the perspectival imagery in Salutati's *De seculo et religione* of 1381/82. In that work, the Florentine chancellor had called on his readers to imagine looking down upon Florence from a high place, such as San Miniato or the twin summits of Fiesole's mountain, "so that Florence might be more fully seen over its whole surface." Do not be fooled, Salutati admonished, by the towering buildings and their splendor, for time is constantly eating away at them and will ultimately triumph.[53] In his sketch of the city lying below him in his

[52] Petrarch, *Rerum familiarium* IV.1, in *Familiari* 1:158 (Latin) and *Familiar Letters*, 1:176–77 (English) (with slight emendations).

[53] Imagining himself on such a promontory, Salutati looks down on the city spread out below and particulary on the cathedral and the *Palazzo della Signoria*: *De seculo et religione*, ed. Berthold L. Ullman (Florence, 1957), 60–61. See also my *Hercules*, 203. Although Salutati is primarily concerned to emphasize the destructive power of time, his description of how the city would appear from the heights suggests Bruni's word-pictures twenty-three years later: "Acendamus, precor, et intueamur minantia menia celo, sidereas turres, immania templa, et immensa palatia, que non, ut sunt, privatorum opibus structa, sed impensa publica vix est creditibile potuisse compleri, et demum vel mente vel oculis ad singula redeuntes consideremus quanta in se detrimenta susceperint. Palatium quidem populi admirabile cunctis et, quod fateri oportet, superbissimum opus, iam mole sua in se ipso resedit et tam intus tam extra rimarum fatiscens hyatibus lentam, licet seram, tamen iam videtur nuntiare ruinam. Basilica vero nostra, stupendum opus, cui si unquam ad exitum venerit, nullum credatur inter mortales edificium posse conferri, tanto sumptu tantaque diligentia inceptum et usque ad quartum iam fornicem consumatum, qua speciossimo campanili coniungitur, quo quidem nedum pulcrius ornari marmoribus sed nec pingi aut cogitari formosius queat, rimam egit, que videatur in deformitatem ruine finaliter evasura, ut post modicum temporis resarciendi non minus futura sit indiga quam complendi ....": *De seculo et religione*, 60–61.

In contrast with his description of Florence in 1381/82, however, Salutati's own

imagination, Salutati employed spatial imagery to reinforce his theme of time's destructive force.

Not unreasonably it may be asked: To what extent did Trecento humanists, who from Petrarch on had been defining historical events in chronological relation to one another and defining the whole temporal series in relationship to their own point in time, create an orientation of self in temporal perspective that could subsequently be transferred in architecture and the visual arts, to spatial dimensions?

---

laudes Florentie, included in his *Invectiva*, 125, composed the year before Bruni's work and perhaps a partial inspiration for it, lacks a perspectival orientation: "Quaenam urbs, non in Italia solum, sed in universo terrarum orbe, est moenibus tutior, superbior palatiis, ornatior templis, formosior aedificiis, quae porticu clarior, platea speciosior, viarum amplitudine laetior; quae populo maior, gloriosior civibus, inexhaustior divitiis, cultior agris; quae gratior situ, salubrior coelo, mundior caeno; quae puteis crebrior, aquis suavior, operosior artibus, admirabilior omnibus; quaenam aedificatior villis, potentior oppidis, municipibus numerosior, agricolis abundantior; quae civitas portu carens tot invehit, tot emittit? Ubi mercatura maior, varietate rerum copiosior, ingeniisque subtilioribus exercitatior: ubinam viri clariores? Et, ut infinitos omittam, quos recensere taedium foret, rebus gestis insignes, armis strenuos, potentes iustis dominantibus, et famosos, ubi Dantes? ubi Petrarca? ubi Boccaccius?"

I am hesitant to insist on the humanists as pioneers of perspectival description because of Dante. Dante's *Convivio* and *Commedia* demonstrate the author's penetrating grasp of contemporary studies on optics – referred to in Dante's time as *perspettiva* (A. Parronchi, "La perspettiva dantesca," in his *Studi su la dolce prospettiva* [Milan, 1964], 3–90). Numerous passages of the *Commedia* embody current theories of light and its refraction (see the texts throughout Parronchi's article). But especially in *Paradiso*, 28–30, Dante went beyond playing with optics to create elaborate panoramas for his persona to behold. These were of course imaginary spectacles, whereas the descriptions of the humanists were of the natural world. Yet Petrarch, Salutati and Bruni would doubtless have had their visual powers stimulated by reading Dante's work.

Influenced by Dante's *Inferno*, Mussato's *Somnium* (1319) describes a dream during a serious illness in which the author flies, as a bird, through Hell and then under the heavens. None of the potential for perspectival vision, however, is realized. See, for example, Mussato, *Varia*, p. 88 (lines 236–44):

> Aspicio celi specimen, stellasque micantes,
> Decernoque polum tali regione secundum,
> Sollicitumque suis stellis ambire Bootem,
> Lucentemque meum plaustrum consurgere, solem.
> Infra conspiciens, terras, composque viventes
> Arboresque comas video, ridentia prata,
> Et dulces voces avium sub frondibus altis
> Et video letas quocumque ex ordine gentes
> Pro libitu variis indutas vestibus omnes.

For a discussion of the poem, see Manlio Dazzi, *Il Mussato preumanista (1261–1329): L'ambiente e l'opera* (Vicenza, 1964), 68–80.

After all, Salutati relied on a panorama of Florence to illustrate the impermanence of temporal achievement, and Bruni's description of the city and its territories was juxtaposed with a historical disquisition on the history of the city. Did the perspectival vision found intimately linked to time in a handful of humanist writings reflect a new awareness of the self as the center for temporal and spatial relationships? Did awareness spread outwards from the humanists, or was their awareness just part of a broader, independent cultural phenomenon? Petrarch's claim to be able to place himself spiritually in any historical era suggested that the self was potentially able to imagine the external world from any focal point in space or time. To what degree did this humanist-generated sense of perspective serve to reinforce the pursuit of illusionistic three-dimensional space initiated by Giotto early in the Trecento and haltingly continued through the fourteenth century?[54]

Certainly humanism played a role in the evolution of a Renaissance aesthetic of "moderation and sobriety, of proportion, balance and geometrical regularity" in the fifteenth century.[55] Within decades of the beginning of the First Ciceronianism, humanist art criticism was apparently being conditioned by aesthetic criteria derived from Ciceronian standards for constructing the periodic sentence.[56] Fixed

[54] Giotto's introduction of convergent perspective into painting is discussed by Samuel Y. Edgerton, Jr., *The Heritage of Giotto's Geometry: Art and Science on the Eve of the Scientific Revolution* (Ithaca and London, 1992), 55–87. In his *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death* (Princeton, 1984; orig. pub. 1952), Millard Meiss characterizes the tendency of Florentine painters in the decades immediately after the Black Death of 1348 to supplant "the equilibrium characteristic of the earlier period between form and space, between solid and void ... by tension between the two .... In all these paintings the perspective serves to force apart forms that are unified otherwise in a plane, or to surround them with a deep space that is incommensuate with their planar character" (23). For late Trecento painting and perspective, see John White, *The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), 103–12. See also the useful summary of Trecento perspective in Martin Kemp, *The Science of Art: Optical Themes in Western Art from Brunelleschi to Seurat* (New Haven and London, 1990), 9–11. The scientific investigation of perspective according to geometric–optical principles in art began with Brunelleschi (Edgerton, *The Heritage of Giotto's Geometry*, 89). On Brunelleschi's relationship with contemporary Florentine literary circles, see Giuliano Tanturli, "Rapporti del Brunelleschi con gli ambienti letterari," in *Brunelleschi: La sua opere e il suo tempo*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1980), 1:125–44.

[55] Santosuosso, "Leonardo Bruni Revisited," 36.

[56] This is the thesis of Michael Baxandall's *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350–1450* (Oxford, 1971). On the problems of developing a critical vocabulary for the arts in the Renaissance, given how little of ancient aesthetic theory was then known, see Paul O. Kristeller,

on imitating the Ciceronian period, having internalized the rules of rhetoric, humanists felt called upon when confronting reality to conceptualize apparently refractory multiplicities in ordered propositions composed of nicely balanced clauses, each one receiving its proper valence, but organically unified. In the exposition of their thought, the humanists resorted to traditional rhetorical categories of similitude, difference, and contrariety as ways of validating and amplifying ideas.[57]

Baxandall notes the tendency of humanists, beginning with Petrarch and Vergerio, to resort frequently to analogies to art and artists in illustrating their arguments, thus preparing the way for the reverse procedure, in which concepts such as *ordo* and *decor*, aesthetic terms commonly guiding judgment of rhetorical achievement, would be transposed into "categories of visual interest" in the fine arts.[58] My only qualification of his thesis lies in his grouping Petrarch with Bruni as a Ciceronian stylist. In fact, Baxandall's examples of periodic sentences are all drawn from fifteenth-century writers, especially from Bruni.[59] While the general categories of rhetorical thinking were as internalized in Petrarch as they were in Bruni, my analysis shows that the revival of Cicero's periodic sentence, which gave traditional categories of rhetoric full play, only occurred after 1400.

While Baxandall does not make the claim, an aesthetic vocabulary borrowed from a rhetoric of order and proportion may perhaps have been more than merely descriptive, more than a particular way of speaking about art. Just as they helped Bruni to construct a new means of conceiving of the Florentine government in the *Laudatio*, Ciceronian principles, internalized by several generations of human-

"The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics," *Renaissance Thought II: Papers on Humanism and the Arts* (New York and Evanston, 1965), 163–227, esp. 178–89. See also the perceptive remarks of T. Price Zimmermann, "Paolo Giovio and the Evolution of Renaissance Art Criticism," in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. Cecil H. Clough (New York, 1976), 406–08.

[57] For Baxandall's description of the humanists' rhetorical cast of mind see *Giotto and the Orators*, 31–33. While recognizing that humanists frequently wrote in short, simple sentences, Baxandall maintains that "the periods might be short but much of the symmetrical or antithetical quality persisted, in smaller units" (29). In my opinion, Baxandall tends to exaggerate the extent to which Ciceronian paradigms controlled humanist thought. See his strong statement, ibid., 44–46.

[58] Ibid., 48.

[59] He states that he is beginning with Petrarch (7).

istically trained patrons, may in time have constituted a new aesthetic vision of art as well as writing. As always, the production of art remained a matter of negotiation between the artist and the patron, but artistic creativity had necessarily to respond to the demands of patrons schooled in the standards of Ciceronian rhetoric.

3

The *Laudatio* emerged as a major document of Renaissance culture and politics with the publication of Hans Baron's now classic work, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, in 1955.[60] In Baron's view, Bruni's *Laudatio* constituted the watershed between early, Petrarchan humanism and later humanism. Early humanism for Baron had been literary, largely apolitical, and basically loyal to the medieval belief that monarchy was the best form of government. Although frequently ambivalent, in the end humanists such as Petrarch and Salutati preferred the contemplative to the active life and believed that Roman history culminated in the rule of Julius Caesar and Caesar Augustus.

In the opening years of the fifteenth century, according to Baron, the young Bruni revived the ancient Roman republican concept that any form of government short of popular rule was tyrannical. Bruni insisted that political freedom stimulated the creative and moral powers of the individual, and that the loss of political freedom destroyed those powers. Bruni was not only the first humanist to revive the ancient ideal of republicanism but the first European to do so since antiquity. His espousal of republicanism was accompanied by an assertion of the value of active participation in civic life and by a

[60] The *Crisis* was first published in two volumes by Princeton University Press in 1955. A revised one-volume edition was published by Princeton in 1966, and a further revised Italian edition was published in 1970. I will cite from the 1966 English edition. In 1955, Baron also published his *Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice* (Cambridge, Mass.), providing a more detailed discussion of certain key texts, largely concerning the crisis of 1402. A complete bibliography of Baron's writings until 1970 is found in *Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, ed. A. Molho and J. Tedeschi (DeKalb, Ill., 1971), lxxi–lxxxvii. The first mention of *Bürgerhumanismus* is in Baron's review of *Soziale Probleme der Renaissance*, by F. Engel-Janosi, in *Historische Zeitschrift* 132 (1925): 136–41, cited by Riccardo Fubini, "Renaissance Historian: The Career of Hans Baron," *Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992): 560, n. 78.

historical analysis showing that the decline of the Roman Empire began with the destruction of republican freedom by Caesar and Augustus. The emphasis on republicanism and civic virtues legitimized the secular life of laymen.

Baron identified the threat posed to Florentine liberty by Giangaleazzo as the catalyst in creating a new humanism. By the late summer of 1402, Visconti armies were well-placed for a direct assault on Florence. The duke's sudden death in September, however, saved the city and cost the Visconti power throughout central and northern Italy.[61] The near-destruction of the Florentine republic awakened its humanists to the priceless gift of liberty that they enjoyed and caused them to reformulate their views on history and politics to accord with their newfound insight.

The most controversial book in twentieth-century Renaissance scholarship, Baron's *Crisis*, even after more than fourty-five years, still largely sets the parameters for treating the issues it raised. Generally, critics have questioned (1) Baron's philological arguments for dating crucial evidence documenting the crisis; (2) the originality of Bruni's statement of republicanism; (3) the extent to which the *Laudatio* accurately described the realities of Florentine politics; and (4) the sincerity of Bruni's commitment to republicanism.[62]

The novelty of my own approach to the discussion is that it looks at the key document of the "crisis," the *Laudatio*, as the product of a drastic change in Latin style reflecting a shift in aesthetic principles that fostered not only a new kind of humanism, but also, in a first stage, an integrated conception of republicanism. By the same token, identifying the *Laudatio* as the pioneering example of the first Ciceronianism by itself does not explain either the motive for composing the work or the success it enjoyed in altering Florentine political discourse. I, therefore, find it necessary to re-examine briefly the criticisms made against the Baron thesis, to assess more precisely the

[61] Gene Brucker, *The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence* (Princeton, 1977), 184–86, describes Florentine actions and attitudes during the summer of 1402 and in the aftermath of the duke's death. During the crisis itself, Brucker sees indications that the Florentines believed themselves to be living in a historic moment (ibid., 186).

[62] These are essentially the criticisms summarized and expanded on, with much new material and greater sophistication, by James Hankins, "The 'Baron Thesis' after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 309–38. See my analysis of these four basic criticisms in "AHR Forum: The *Crisis* after Forty Years," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996): 110–18.

role of the stylistic change that I have identified in the genesis of civic humanism.

(1) While the date for the composition of the *Laudatio* has now been definitely established as the summer of 1404, two years after the Milanese defeat, Baron's dating of other works used to prove the catalytic significance of 1402 has been generally rejected. His efforts to show by dating or redating relevant material that Salutati and Bruni both altered their political attitudes after 1402 have been proven untenable. The same is true for his claim that Cino Rinuccini, for Baron a nonhumanist unburdened with Petrarchan suppositions, preceded Bruni in formulating a republican response to the Milanese threat.[63] Nevertheless, it could be argued that the successful destruction of the Milanese threat created an atmosphere of optimism in Florence that could have inspired a member of the younger generation to write a work enshrining the values that he believed to have been at stake in the conflict.

(2) As for the criticism that Baron overlooked earlier "theories" or "ideologies" of republicanism, scholars are now generally in agreement that he failed to give adequate consideration to formulations of republican theory by two scholastic writers, Ptolemy of Lucca and Marsilio of Padua. In Baron's defense, as I pointed out in chapters 4 and 5, neither Marsilio's nor Ptolemy's republican thought seems to have had a palpable influence on humanists like Salutati or Bruni. Bruni's republicanism, therefore, would have been the first theoretical formulation of historical importance.[64]

It must be said as well that Baron advanced the date of Bruni's formulation of "committed republicanism" by more than twenty years, and subsequent scholars, including Baron's critics, have largely followed him in this interpretation. Even though Bruni found the roots of Florence's uniqueness in its republican institutions, scrutiny of the *Laudatio*'s arguments makes clear that there is no explicit theoretical claim there for the superiority of republicanism to monarchy or aristocracy.[65] The enemy of Florentine republicanism is not mon-

[63] See my discussion of the dating of the key works in Baron's thesis, "AHR Forum," 111–13.

[64] On Ptolemy and on Marsilio, see above, 210–13 and 154–56 respectively.

[65] James Hankins points this out in "Rhetoric, History, and Ideology: The Civic Panegyrics of Leonardo Bruni," in *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections*, ed. J. Hankins (Cambridge and New York, forthcoming). I will cite the manuscript version without pagination. In my view, the reason why Baron never made it clear that Bruni's *Laudatio* was not an attack on all other forms of polity was that

archy, but tyranny, the traditional foe of all good political constitutions. Admittedly, Bruni wove together historical and psychological themes in such a way as to point toward the claim that republican government, as embodied in the Florentine constitution, was superior to any other form of government, but that position was far from the radical one that he would take in 1428 in the *Oratio in funere Johannis Stroze equitis florentini*, where for the first and only time in his writings he expressed the idea that a republican constitution provided the only legitimate form of government.

Baron was the first to stress the republican character of the *Oratio in funere*.[66] Rehearsing the *Laudatio*'s claim that Florence's republican government ensured not only liberty but equity for all, the *Oratio* drew on the hitherto neglected element of Aristides' praise of Athens to depict Florence as offering every citizen the possibility of earning recognition provided that he was industrious, intelligent, and led a virtuous life, a theme to be heard again as "the career open to talents."[67]

Although the late date of Bruni's single radical-republican claim and its confinement to one oration do not invalidate the claim that Bruni was the most important republican humanist, they do make

---

Baron was prone to identify monarchy with tyranny and read his documents accordingly. For instance, he gave the title "Paduan Ideas on Tyranny" to his discussion of Conversino's defense of monarchy in the *Dragmalogia* (134). With a backward glance at his analysis of Vergerio's *De monarchia* in the preceding pages, Baron wrote that Vergerio in this regard "must have sensed a kindred spirit in Conversino, since he advised him to send a copy of the *Dragmalogia* to the Pope, or even dedicate the book to him" (135). On 161, Baron presented Salutati's *De tyranno* as a "justification of Caesar's 'Tyranny,'" whereas in fact Salutati specifically wanted to prove that Caesar was a legitimate monarch. On 120, Baron writes of "tyrannical monarchism."

[66] Baron, *Crisis*, 412–24 and 428–32. For editions and previous bibliographical references, see *Crisis*, 554–56 and n. 31. Cino Rinuccini, *Risponsiva all'invettiva di messer Antonio Luscho*, in Coluccio Salutati, *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum vicentinum*, ed. D. Moreni (Florence, 1826), 219, probably read Bruni's work this way and made this theoretical claim.

[67] *Crisis*, 419. The theoretical core of the work is found in Daub's *Leonardo Brunis Rede auf Nanni Strozzi*, 285: "Forma reipublice gubernande utimur ad libertatem paritatemque civium maxime omnium directa: quae quia equalis est in omnibus, popularis nuncupatur. Neminem enim unum quasi dominum horremus, non paucorum potentie inservimus: equa omnibus libertas, legibus solum obtemperans, soluta hominum metu. Spes vero honoris adipiscendi ac se attollendi omnibus par, modo industria adsit, modo ingenium et vivendi ratio quaedam probata et gravis .... Haec est vera libertas, haec equitas civitatis, nullius vim, nullius injuriam vereri, paritatem esse juris inter se civibus, paritatem rei publicae adeunde. Hec autem nec in unius dominatu nec in paucorum possunt existere."

Bruni seem a less "committed republican" than Baron maintained, while at the same time helping to explain what otherwise might be regarded as Bruni's betrayal of his supposed political principles.

James Hankins has given a complex and convincing explanation for the radical aspects of the Strozzi funeral oration of 1428.[68] On the surface, Nanni Strozzi was an unlikely candidate for an elaborate funeral oration praising the heroic death of a Florentine in the service of his *patria.* A bastard son of a Florentine exile, not born in Florence and not a Florentine citizen, Nanni was a mercenary in the service of Florence's ally, the Marquis of Ferrara. The battle in which he died had little military significance, and in it he did not particularly distinguish himself.

Hankins ascribes to Bruni a series of motives for seizing upon Nanni's death as an occasion to celebrate both the republican constitution of the city and the Strozzi family. The most important are linked with the troubles of a regime that had just fought an unpopular war against Lucca. Bruni insisted that the city was united and that its constitution fostered much social and political mobility. Those claims were pitched at both a domestic and a foreign audience. At home, Bruni sought to stir up patriotism as well as shoring up the regime by patching over the growing class divisions within the city. Abroad, he sought to assure foreign governments that Florence remained unified in support of its government. He had personal objectives as well: to boost the prestige of Palla Strozzi, his good friend, who had been closely involved in the war effort, and perhaps to obtain public maintenance for Nanni Strozzi's children. In my view, the exigencies of the moment prompted Bruni to espouse a radical position that did not accord with his normal political view. That view was that, while Florence's republican constitution was integral to the city's creativity and strength, any government serving the good of the community was legitimate.

I should emphasize here what has never been clearly said about Bruni's republican statements. Not one is to be found in the *missive* during his chancellorship. The introduction in the public letters of theoretical statements or historical anecdotes exalting republican government began and ended with Salutati's chancery.[69] Bruni, like

[68] James Hankins, "Rhetoric, History and Ideology."

[69] For the few republican remarks in the *missive* before Salutati, see my *Salutati and His Letters*, 48–49.

all his predecessors – but with greater awareness than they – avoided making such remarks, probably so as not to alienate princely powers. The major evidence for his republicanism, accordingly, comes from his orations, where he spoke as an individual, although one whose authority increased with time. This does not mean that he wrote only for a Florentine audience; he doubtless knew that his words would ultimately have a wide circulation in learned circles throughout the peninsula.

(3) One of the persistent criticisms of Baron's characterization of the *Laudatio* as republican has been that Florence was not in fact the republic that Bruni claimed it was. Therefore, critics conclude, the *Laudatio* was a piece of propaganda written to conceal the real oligarchical sources of power within the city.[70] To an extent, the criticism is fair: dealing primarily with international affairs, Baron glossed over domestic politics, about which enough was known in the early 1950s to have made his account of Florentine republicanism problematic. Indeed, Baron's claims about Florentine life have been in no small way responsible, thanks to the debates to which they have given rise, for making the last four decades into a golden age for Florentine studies.

To my mind, John Najemy, drawing on his own extensive research and that of other historians such as Nicolai Rubinstein, Marvin Becker, Gene Brucker, Anthony Molho, and Dale and William Kent, characterizes the domestic political scene in the early years of the fifteenth century most convincingly. In Najemy's view, while the Florentine government in 1404 was in fact controlled by a small number of elite families, the elite had by then largely appropri-

[70] Among proponents of this position are Peter Herde and Jerrold Seigel. See Herde, "Politik und Rhetorik in Florenz am Vorabend der Renaissance: Die ideologische Rechtfertigung der Florentiner Aussenpolitik durch Coluccio Salutati," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965): 141–220, especially 212–20; idem, "Politische Verhaltensweisen der Florentiner Oligarchie, 1382–1402," in *Geschichte und Verfassungsgefüge: Frankfurter Festgabe für Walter Schlesinger* (Wiesbaden, 1973), 156–249, especially his conclusion, 249; and Jerrold Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism: The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom (Petrarch to Valla)* (Princeton, 1968), 245–54. See also Michael Seidlmayer, *Wege und Wandlungen des Humanismus: Studien zu seinen politischen, ethischen, religiösen Problemen* (Göttingen, 1965), 47–74. An article by Philip Jones, a general treatment of the oligarchical nature of Italian politics in the period, supports Baron's critics on this point: "Communes and Despots: The City-State in Late-Medieval Italy," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 15 (1965): 71–96. See also Jones's review of the 2nd edition of *Crisis* (*History* 53 [1968]: 410–13).

ated the language of the popular opposition that it had historically faced – the language of "consent, representation, delegation, accountability." The elite had learned to exercise control through many of the institutions created in the past under the more democratic regimes of the guild community (*popolo*).[71] Whereas at the beginning of the fourteenth century chivalric manners had provided the model for the upper crust of Florentine society, by the century's end, members of the elite had modified their comportment as part of an ongoing struggle to appropriate the discourse of the popular forces in the commune and to forge alliances with them. Not to have done so would have cost the elite its political authority.

One of the major theses of the present study is that the evolution of the Florentine patrician mentality, which Najemy accounts for in terms of tensions and often open conflict between social groups, had a second and complementary origin. From the beginning, with Albertano, part of the lure of antiquity was that it seemed to offer a possible escape from the cycle of communal conflict. An antidote to civic violence, the Roman ideal of service to the common good – for Albertano, expressed primarily by Seneca – contrasted with the chivalric emphasis on personal honor and loyalty to superiors that justified endemic factionalism. In Florence, Latini, envisioning Cicero rather than Seneca as the patron of civic unity, embarked upon a mission to translate Cicero's oratorical work, in the belief that through rhetoric the Florentines, riven by dissension, could learn the virtues of citizenship. In the early decades of the fourteenth century, the sermons of Fra Girolamo de' Remigi added Christian sanctions to Latini's secular call to serve the commune.

In the same years, Florence witnessed an increasing interest in ancient Roman literature. Although blunted in their full effects by

[71] John Najemy, "The Dialogue of Power in Florentine Politics," in *City-States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, ed. A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, and J. Emlen (Ann Arbor, 1991), 269–88, describes the transformation of the Florentine elite from a ruling group whose power in the thirteenth century rested mainly on hereditary claims to command and on brute force to one whose "political style" – largely borrowed from their popular opposition – was to seek legitimacy by attaining popular consent. In his use of the phrase "political style," Najemy makes clear that the elite did not really embrace the objectives sought by former popular regimes (281). By the late fourteenth century, in an apparent paradox, the political class of the city progressively expanded, while the governing elite narrowed. See Najemy's cogent observations on these phenomena in *Corporatism and Consensus in Florentine Electoral Politics, 1280–1400* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1983), 263–65.

translation, the ancient Roman works still projected an image of a civil society founded on an ethic of duty, discipline, and patriotism that was foreign to chivalric romance. In the latter half of the fourteenth century, the presence of humanists like Salutati, who continually invoked ancient civic values, could not help but make clear the lessons found in the translations of the classics that they read. In sum, more than a century of schooling in ancient Roman morality could not have failed by 1400 to contribute to a transformation in the mentality of the political elite. Najemy is right to emphasize that Florentine patricians' efforts to quell conflict with the people served their own interests. My point is simply that the patricians' willingness to conceive of government in a manner foreign to them a century earlier was not simply a conscious, self-interested stratagem to gain power, but rather a result of extended contact with ancient literature and history, wherein the ancient civic ethic and republicanism were extolled.

If self-interest is to be introduced as a historical explanation, it too has to be historicized, because what satisfies self-interest depends on whatever constellation of values and ideas a particular group of people holds at a particular time.[72] The discovery of twentieth-century historians that from the late Trecento Florence was ruled by an oligarchy rather than a republic tells us nothing by itself about how contemporary Florentines looked on their government. It would never have occurred to fifteenth-century Florentines, for example, that Cicero, who we know died defending the oligarchical polity of the last century of the Roman Republic, was not a republican martyr. Consequently, although general agreement exists about the oli-

[72] Charles Trinkaus, "Humanistic Dissidence: Florence Versus Milan, or Poggio Versus Valla?" in *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations: Acts of Two Conferences at Villa I Tatti in 1976-1977*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and C. Smyth, 2 vols. (Florence, 1989), 1:21, aptly remarks: "As historians we are dealing with individuals and with interpersonal relations, and we project the social, religious, moral, psychological and historical categories we ourselves utilize as hypotheses of variable validity. We are aided by the various forms of self-consciousness previously projected by the individuals and groups we study and are perhaps closer to authenticity when we try to follow their own visions rather than those of colleagues in our disciplines."

One is reminded of the now largely discredited thesis of Lewis R. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, 2 vols. (London, 1929), 1:4, who opens his discussion of the way eighteenth-century men sought seats in Parliament: "Men went there 'to make a figure,' and no more dreamt of a seat in the House in order to benefit humanity than a child dreams of a birthday cake that others may eat it; which is perfectly normal and in no way reprehensible."

garchical status of Florence's government, the *Laudatio*'s stress on representation and consent should not simply be taken as a conscious, cynical distortion designed to conceal the realities of Florentine political life under the mantle of republicanism.

Perhaps the best evidence that the *Laudatio* accurately depicted the mentality of the elite of the city lies in the fact that less than a decade later, the leaders of the regime used the representation of Florence developed in the *Laudatio* in discussing matters of domestic and foreign policy not merely in public but in their inner councils.[73] We can be sure that the Florentine elite would have liked to believe what Bruni affirmed:

> While in other cities the majority often overturns the better part, in Florence it has always happened that the majority view has been identical with that of the best citizens.[74]

(4) The tendency to identify the *Laudatio* as propaganda for the reigning oligarchy easily leads to questioning Bruni's sincerity in writing the composition. Baron was of course ready to admit that the work contained exaggerations, but he believed that Bruni spoke as an ardent republican. I do not think it false to his interpretation to say that he recognized that self-interested motives could also be involved. A provincial, wishing to make his career in the city and at thirty-three without a law degree or secure position, Bruni resolved to bring himself to the attention of the regime in a work that epitomized not only his learning and eloquence, but the relevance of those talents to the political life of the city. Salutati was clearly failing physically, and before long the chancellor's position would be vacant.

But a wide gulf exists between the recognition that self-interest played a role in Bruni's writing his oration and the charge that he

---

[73] Brucker, *The Civic World*, 300–02.

[74] Kohl and Witt, *The Earthly Republic*, 158. The Latin reads (*Laudatio*, 250): "Sed in aliis quidem populis maior pars sepe meliorem vincit; in hac autem civitate eadem semper videtur fuisse melior que maior." Cf. Najemy, "Dialogue of Power," 279.

My impression is that the honeymoon of consensus in the aftermath of the Milanese Wars was brief. Riccardo Fubini, "From Social to Political Representation in Renaissance Florence," in *City-States in Classical Antiquity*, 223–39, offers convincing evidence that, despite the ascendancy of the elite, the city was deeply divided in the fifteenth century, with opposition often using the republic's councils to hinder the regime's political objectives. Of course, this would support Bruni's position that while the *Signoria* exerted "a kind of kingly power," it was controlled by a series of checks and balances (Bruni, *Laudatio*, 259).

wrote it as a professional rhetorician, as if to say that he himself had no personal allegiance to the ideas he was expressing or that he picked his arguments from a ready-made arsenal of arguments.[75] To make this claim is to lose sight of the historical context in which Bruni wrote.

Cicero's orations served Bruni as a guide for bringing together in an integrated form themes, attitudes, and arguments already present in his intellectual surroundings in fragmentary form. But Cicero's oratorical writings had been circulating in western Europe for centuries without producing a similar phenomenon. Cicero, the orator, had to be rediscovered, and, not coincidentally, the investigation was undertaken in republican Florence.

Brunetto Latini had known well that republican politics required speeches, but he had failed to convince his contemporaries of a close tie between political freedom and eloquence. By the middle of the next century, though, humanists or humanist sympathizers like Gianfigliazzi and Lapo took up Latini's mission by seeking to reform oratory on the basis of closer adherence to the rules provided in the Ciceronian handbooks. In their turn, Rinuccini and Malpaghini took the next step, by introducing Cicero's speeches themselves into the classroom curriculum, where Bruni studied them.

The example of Bruni's fellow student, Vergerio, shows, however, that the study of these works did not by itself inspire a republican conception of history or politics. The works' effects could have been limited to scholarly research. Rather, when Bruni came to Cicero seeking a way of conceptualizing current Florentine political society, he brought with him a historical experience that shaped his study of the ancient writer's political ideas.

Although in 1378 Florence emerged defeated from its three-year struggle with the papacy, it had proven itself almost equal in strength to the enemy.[76] Between 1389 and 1402, the series of wars with the

[75] That Bruni should be seen as a professional rhetorician with no commitment to republican ideas is the position especially identified with Peter Herde and Jerrold Seigel (see above, 424, n. 70). See especially Seigel's "'Civic humanism' or 'Ciceronian Rhetoric'? The Culture of Petrarch and Bruni," *Past and Present* 34 (1966): 3–48.

[76] Baron, *Crisis*, 23–46, describes the change in Florence's position between the 1370s and 1402, which leads naturally into his thesis that humanism became "fused with the civic world in the crucible" (45) of the events surrounding the death of Giangaleazzo. Despite this sketch of Florence's emergence as an Italian power, Baron tends to explain Salutati's ambivalent attitudes toward the empire and Florence's political status as a function of his loyalty to Petrarch's ideals, rather than

Visconti, which ended in the curtailment of the family's empire, were a source not only of increased prestige for Florence in the eyes of foreign powers, but also of increased self-esteem. From the 1370s on, therefore, the Florentines acted as if they sensed that the Florence of the Middle Ages, neatly tucked into the communal organization of central and northern Italy and living under the shadows of the papacy and empire, had ceased to exist.

Salutati's life spanned the age of transition. In him existed commitments to the old order and allegiances to the new. He had grown up with deep respect for the empire and its traditions, but he shared in Florence's increasing sense of autonomous political existence, a sense that he himself had helped to foster in the *missive*. In his statements on politics, furthermore, Salutati reflected the contradictions entailed by the welter of his commitments. Leonardo Bruni, born in 1370, belonged, for his part, to the new age. Because for Bruni's generation the empire was a relic, he could regard Florence as an independent power and borrow republican symbols and concepts from his master, without being hobbled by competing allegiances.[77]

The surprising triumph of the republic over the duke created an intellectual challenge for the young man. Granted that the republic had been saved by the duke's death, still the long years of war demonstrated the immense financial resources at the republic's disposal and its willingness to use them not merely to survive but also to acquire territory. What were the sources of the energy evinced by the city not only in fighting its wars but in other, more creative ways? Salutati had just made the exciting discovery that Florence had been

---

recognizing the influence on Salutati of his earlier political experience and loyalties.

This paragraph of the text and the following two are based on my "The *De tyranno* and Coluccio Salutati's View of Politics and Roman History," *Nuova rivista storica* 53 (1969): 474.

[77] In 1401, Rupert of Bavaria, the emperor, had disgraced his office by serving Florence as a mercenary. Drubbed in his first encounter with Visconti troops and unable to extract more money from the Florentines for a second stint of employment, he beat a retreat back to Germany. After Bruni's native Arezzo was absorbed into the Florentine empire, he seems to have identified with Florence's fortunes, which after the death of Giangaleazzo seemed promising. Arthur Field, however, has discovered a puzzling document sent by a Milanese spy, a certain Abbatino of Arezzo, to Filippo Maria Visconti in January 1437, in which the spy claims that Bruni was sympathetic to a plot to cause a rebellion in Arezzo. Field is unable to establish whether the claim is accurate or concocted: Arthur Field, "Leonardo Bruni, Florentine Traitor? Bruni, the Medici, and an Aretine Conspiracy of 1437," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 1109–50.

founded under the Roman Republic; he had exposed as mere myth that it had been founded by Caesar, a myth difficult to reconcile with Florence's republican traditions. On the heels of the discovery of Florence's republican origin was Bruni's insight in reading Tacitus that the advent of tyranny in Rome led to intellectual decline.[78] As for Rome then, so for Florence now: Bruni saw Florence's success in repelling the Visconti conquest as an escape from the fate that had befallen the city's progenitor.

Bruni was probably not immune, however, from a general sense of unease about the disparity between traditional conceptions of Florentine government and current political reality. By 1400, the interpretation of Florentine political society as a grouping of corporate bodies had lost its meaning, but no new one had replaced it. Dominated by a relatively small group of patrician families, Florentine political society now operated in practice as a unified whole. How was this essentially elitist government to be conceived, a government that claimed to function according to the principles of the traditional popular opposition? Cicero's late Roman republican thought, in which the *auctoritas* of leading statesmen figured prominently, provided Bruni with the solution to his conceptual problem. It is no exaggeration to say that the *Laudatio* not only shows the answer Bruni found, but that his solution effected the marriage between humanism and the Florentine patriciate.

To speak of the *Laudatio*, therefore, as a kind of rhetorical flourish overlooks the fact that the work represents a series of hard-won positions – results of scholarly discoveries and of struggles to comprehend historical change – authorized by the most respected wise man of ancient Rome. Admittedly, intense original thought does not necessarily lead a person to accept its conclusions with enthusiasm, but in Bruni's case I think he embraced republican government, as it existed in Florence, as superior to other forms of government in contemporary Italy. While Bruni himself admitted to having exaggerated certain details in the work, he never confessed to having distorted its basic themes.[79]

[78] Surprisingly, despite his wide knowledge of ancient sources, there is no proof that Salutati ever read Tacitus before Bruni used him in his encomium. For references, see the contradictory passages of Salutati, *Epist.*, 2:297 and 3:81–82, and my discussion in *Hercules*, 167.

[79] After his republication of the *Laudatio*, Bruni admitted that he had exaggerated, but his example of what he considered exaggerations did not involve fundamental themes in the work: Bruni, *Epist.*, 2:110–15. See my "AHR Forum," 116.

The great flaw of Baron's interpretation of Bruni, though, was to consider this humanist primarily as a political man. Like all true scholars, Bruni was attracted to a life of study: although in later life he was deeply involved in Florentine politics, he was not primarily a political theorist, nor was he a republican firebrand.[80] In his funeral oration for Nanni Strozzi in 1428, he must have been aware that the idealized republic that he represented Florence to be did not match the realities of political life in the city. Yet that did not mean that he no longer saw Florence as a republic.

I am convinced that, while knowingly exaggerating the republican character of Florence in the *Laudatio* and grossly so in the *Oratio funebris*, Bruni sincerely believed that a dynamic relationship prevailed between the city's republican institutions and its creativity. In retrospect, with all the accumulated research of the last half-century on Florentine political life, it would be difficult to prove him wrong. Home to occasional but intense political turmoil, Florence offered Bruni wealth and position but, just as important, an environment in which he ultimately found he was able to do his best work.

[80] James Hankins has assessed Bruni's sincerity on the basis of a thorough knowledge of Bruni's immense corpus of writings. Hankins concludes in "The 'Baron Thesis'" that Bruni did not have a strong republican commitment, and his main evidence is as follows: (1) the disparity between what Bruni wrote in his official *missive* and his private statements (318–325); (2) Bruni's willingness to work for the papacy and for minor lords (324–25); and (3) Bruni's own description of Florentine politics in his Greek treatise *On the Polity of the Florentines* (1439) as "not completely aristocratic or democratic, but a kind of mixture of the two" (325). The text of *On the Polity* is published in *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts*, trans. and ed. Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins, and David Thompson (Binghamton, N.Y., 1987), 171–74. For Bruni's willingness to work for minor lords, see Paolo Viti, *Leonardo Bruni e Firenze: Studi sulle lettere pubbliche e private* (Florence, 1992), 368–69.

While I agree with Hankins that Bruni was primarily a scholar and that he was not simply a rhetorician, I do not share his preoccupation with attempting to assess whether Bruni's republicanism was sincere or not. As John Martin has recently pointed out, notions of sincerity were being constructed in European Renaissance courts. To impose our own criteria for sincerity on Renaissance men is to beg complex questions about the development of their norms and our own. See Martin, "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe," *American Historical Review* 102 (1997), 1309–42.

On the Polity of the Florentines was composed for visiting Byzantine dignitaries; the Byzantines, as Hankins points out, were antirepublican ("The 'Baron Thesis,'" 326). In not drawing attention to Florence's being a republic, Bruni was surely playing to his audience. Still, to point out that Florence was neither completely aristocratic nor democratic hardly amounts to a repudiation of republicanism.

4

Bruni's *Dialogi ad Petrum Istrum*, probably entirely written after Salutati's death, most likely in 1408, provides a summary of the divisive issues that troubled Salutati's relationship with his disciples in his final two years of life.[81] The studied ambiguity of its conclusions probably made it as difficult for Bruni's contemporaries to characterize his position in the work as it has proven to be for modern scholars. In this period of dramatic linguistic shift, Bruni himself may even have had difficulty explaining his intended meaning.[82] We cannot ignore, though, that to some extent the heated discussion of the *Dialogi* was an artistic enterprise, that is, Bruni's effort to imitate a Ciceronian dialogue, complete with problematic conclusions.[83] By

[81] The *Dialogi* have been published five times: Theodor Klette, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur der italienischen Gelehrtenrenaissance*, 3 vols. in 1 (Greifswald, 1889), 2:39–83; *I Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*, ed. Giuseppe Kirner (Livorno, 1889); *Dialogus de tribus vatibus Florentinis*, ed. Carl Wotke (Vienna, 1889); Marco di Franco, *Dialogi al Vergerio di Leonardo Bruni* (Catania, 1929); and *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*, ed. Eugenio Garin, *Prosatori*, 41–99. For English translations, see *The Three Crowns of Florence: Humanist Assessments of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio*, trans. and ed. D. Thompson and A.F. Nagel (New York, 1972); and Griffiths et al., eds., *Humanism of Leonardo Bruni*, 63–84. For the bibliography relating to the dating of the *Dialogi*, see Hankins, "The Dates of *Ep.* 1.1 [1.8], the Latin *Phaedo*, the *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*," in his *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2:370–76; and Riccardo Fubini, "All'uscita dalla Scolastica medievale," 1073. I agree with Fubini that the work was written after Salutati's death, probably in 1408 (1092).

[82] Baron, *Crisis*, 450, takes Niccoli's recantation in the second part of the *Dialogi* at face value, while scholarly opinion both before and after Baron generally has not. In his excellent chapter on the *Dialogi*, David Marsh, *The Quattrocento Dialogue: Classical Tradition and Humanist Innovation* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1980), 37, interprets the work as endeavoring to reach "a rapprochement between the new classicism of humanist learning and the traditional culture of the merchant oligarchy," but he renders no judgment on Bruni's real position. David Quint, "Humanism and Modernity: A Reconsideration of Bruni's *Dialogues*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 423–45, envisages Bruni, the author, caught in the tension between his aspirations as a professional rhetorician, eager to encourage literary productivity, and his sense that the greatness of antiquity could never be captured by contemporary writers. This is close to the position I take here. Riccardo Fubini, "All'uscita dalla Scolastica medievale," 1082, considers the work an emphatic denunciation of Scholasticism. I agree with Fubini to the extent that the *Dialogi* aim at illustrating a more problematic attitude toward truth than that offered by the dialectic mentality, inherited from Scholasticism. But with Quint, I tend to see as the driving force of the work an ambivalent attitude toward contemporary prospects for artistic achievement.

[83] Marsh, *The Quattrocento Dialogue*, 8–9, characterizes the Ciceronian dialogue as privileging persuasion rather than instruction and as dramatizing the conflict of opinion between learned men in the context of leisurely, friendly discussion. Lars B.

the same token, we know from material earlier in this chapter that the positions debated in Bruni's dialogues reflected actual discussions in Bruni's milieu and that the author of the *Dialogi* was an active participant in them. It has been pointed out as well that the speeches of Niccoli in the first and second dialogues seem almost to parallel the positions attributed to Poggio in Salutati's two letters to him in 1405–06.[84]

In contrast to the Greek model, which Bruni had used for the *Laudatio*, the *Dialogi* had an identifiable Latin subtext in Cicero's *De oratore* I and II.[85] Whereas in the *Laudatio* Bruni had relied on Aristides for ideas, imagery, and an occasional phrase, in the *Dialogi* his imitation of Cicero extended to generic imitation of periodic structure, rhythm, and lexicon.[86] The key aspect of the dialogue's construction, the volteface of Niccoli, who in the second dialogue refuted the position that he had assumed in the first, paralleled that of Antonio in Cicero's *De oratore* I and II. In both cases, the earlier stance is presented as having been taken only to provoke discussion, and in both the rebuttal is patently inadequate to undermine the original arguments.

Dedicated to Pierpaolo Vergerio, who, according to the preface, had left Florence only a short time before (*nuper*), Bruni's *Dialogi* claimed to be the report of a recent discussion over two days, on the first at Salutati's house and on the second at Roberto Rossi's, between Salutati and members of his circle, Niccolò Niccoli, Bruni, and Roberto Rossi, with Pietro Sermini also present on the second day. Speaking in his own person in the preface, Bruni maintained the buoyant mood of the *Laudatio*, extolling Florence specifically in this case because

---

Mortensen, "Leonardo Bruni's *Dialogus*: A Ciceronian Debate on the Literary Culture of Florence," *Classica et mediaevalia* 37 (1986): 297, writes: "Bruni imitates all the formal features of Cicero's dialogue except one: he has left out a proper proem to the second book."

[84] Fubini, "All'uscita dalla Scolastica medievale," 1082.

[85] Marsh, *The Quattrocento Dialogue*, 26–30, and Quint, "Humanism and Modernity," 433–35.

[86] For paraphrasing, see Marsh, *The Quattrocento Dialogue*, 122–23, nn. 7–12. In a review of an Italian translation of the *Dialogi*, Sabbadini, referring to Marco di Franco's edition, finds only one neologism, *amicitior* (38): *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 96 (1930): 130.

> some seeds of the liberal arts and of all human culture, which once seemed completely dead, remained here and grow day by day and very soon, I believe, they will bring forth no inconsiderable light.[87]

While suggesting that to this point only a modest cultural recovery has occurred, Bruni, perhaps mindful of his own potential for literary achievement, expressed optimism about the future.

Salutati initiates the discussion on the first day by criticizing the younger men in his company for failing to practice, as he did at their age, the art of disputation (*disputatio*), a term that he defines as discussion (*discerptatio*) or conversation (*collucatio*).[88] He apparently is not referring to the kind of public debate common among contemporary Scholastics, but rather to the informal exchange of arguments on a particular issue between friends. Within this context, Salutati points again, as in his letter to Poggio of December 17, 1405, to Luigi Marsili as the authoritative master of both Christian and pagan learning. In Marsili's lifetime, Salutati relates, he himself conversed regularly with the learned Augustinian, who taught him many things.

To this appeal Niccolò Niccoli replies that, while he recognizes the supreme value of dialogue, he personally lacks the learning or elo-

---

[87] I use the English translation of James Hankins in *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni*, 63. The Latin text is found in *Prosatori latini*, 44. In my notes, I give the page of the English text followed by the page of the Latin one. Hankins has emphasized the importance of the preface for determining Bruni's attitude toward the Three Crowns, which, he believes, accords with Salutati's rather than Niccoli's in the dialogue (56–57). I would suspect that Bruni agrees more with Niccoli, at least on the Latin works of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio.

[88] *Dialogi*, 64; 50–52: "Ego enim qui in hanc diem ita vixi, ut omne meum tempus atque omnem operam in studio discendi consumpserim, tantos mihi video fructus ex his sive disceptionibus sive collocutionibus, quas disputationes appello, consecutus, ut eorum quae dicerim magnam partem huic uni rei feram acceptam." Bruni seems here to be referring to *De oratore*, I.6.22–23, where *disputatio* is used to mean dialogue or discussion. I do not agree with Riccardo Fubini that *disputationes* here means scholastic disputation ("All'uscita della Scolastica medievale," 1081–84). In subsequent passages of the *Dialogi*, Niccoli does not seem to me to be implicitly attacking Salutati's attachment to scholastic disputation. Otherwise it would be difficult to understand Poggio's affirmative reply (52): "Est ita profecto, inquit, Salutate, ut ais. Neque enim facile reperiri posset, ut credo, quod ad studia nostra plus quam disputatio conferat." Niccoli also adds that Chrysoloras is the one "a quo isti litteras graecas didicere, cum ego aliquando adessem, quod, ut scitis, faciebam frequenter, nullam aeque ad rem ut ad conferendum inter se aliquid auditores cohortatus est." Niccoli seems, rather, to be criticizing the scholastics for having corrupted *disputatio* as a form for true scholarly interchange. See also Gary Remer, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (University Park, Penn., 1996), 26–41, for a discussion of the role of Scholasticism in the *Dialogi*.

quence to undertake such an exercise. Furthermore, he bitterly attacks modern logicians, especially the *Britannici*, who have ruined dialectic, an essential instrument in disputation, with their sophistic forms of reasoning (58–60). Indeed, he continues, the modern age has lost the "patrimony" of ancient culture. He specifically rejects the writings of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio as unworthy of comparison with those of ancient pagan writers. From his general condemnation of modern talents, however, he diplomatically exempts Salutati.

Among the several instances of Dante's manifest ignorance in the *Commedia*, Niccoli singles out the depiction of Brutus and Cassius in the mouth of Satan (*Inf.* 34), the very representation defended so strenuously in Salutati's *De tyranno* a few years before. If Dante placed Junius Brutus, the murderer of Tarquin, who was at least a legitimate ruler, in the highest circle of hell, he should also have placed Marcus Brutus there "for having ripped the liberty of the Roman people from the jaws of robbers" (70). Furthermore, the crudeness of the Latin prose found in Dante's carefully constructed letters shows that he has no place in the company of educated men.

As for Petrarch, the *Africa*, for which the author had such high hopes, proved to be a "ridiculous mouse." Whereas Virgil made obscure men famous, Petrarch made famous ones obscure. His bucolic poetry lacked the perfume of meadows or woods, and his orations were bereft of rhetorical skill. The same accusations could be brought against Boccaccio. Addressing the three men as *infelices*, Niccoli concludes:

> I, by heaven, put far ahead of all of your little books one letter of Cicero, one single poem of Virgil.[89]

Claiming to be convinced of Niccoli's insincerity, Salutati postpones the refutation of Niccoli's position until the following day.

The second dialogue, portraying what is purportedly the next day's discussion, is primarily given over to Niccoli's self-rebuttal. Taking up the defense of the literary giants of Florence, Niccoli confesses that he was in no way expressing his own thoughts in the first dialogue but was trying to provoke discussion. Yet his supposed defense of the Three Crowns, whose reputations he had pummeled on the first day, amounts to a continuing condemnation of their

[89] "Ego mehercule unam Ciceronis epistolam atque unum Virgilii carmen omnibus vestris opusculis longissime antepono" (Petrarch, *Prose*, 74).

literary abilities, albeit a more subtle one. In the case of Dante, Niccoli maintains that the poet knew well Caesar's tyranny and Brutus's great-souled character; only one ignorant of the ancient sources, he slyly remarks, could justify Caesar's actions. Canto 34 of the *Inferno* must be interpreted allegorically, with Caesar representing "the most just monarchy of the world" and Brutus his assassin. This leaves Niccoli's audience with a choice between accepting a dubious allegorical explanation or conceding the original complaint against Dante's ignorance. Similarly, Niccoli dismisses his earlier charge that Dante lacked knowledge of Latin, with the superficial answer that one who, like Dante, engaged in disputations, wrote poetry, and knew so many things must have known Latin well.

As for Petrarch, Niccoli rises to his defense by reporting that, when not long after Petrarch's death he had gone to Padua to make copies of his manuscripts, he encountered Petrarch's former acquaintances, who praised his personal character and his writings. If foreigners praise our fellow citizen so highly, he asks, are we not to match them? Echoing Poggio's assessment in his second letter to Salutati, Niccoli lauds Petrarch as the one who

> restored humanistic studies, which had been extinguished, and opened the way for us to be able to learn.[90]

Referring to the *Africa*, which he had earlier criticized so severely, Niccoli says only that Petrarch died before he could polish the lines and asserts facetiously of the *Bucolica* that they are "stuffed with shepherds and flocks."[91] Indeed, as opposed to his preference of the first day for one poem of Virgil and one epistle of Cicero to all the works of the Three Crowns, Niccoli now says:

> I far prefer an oration of Petrarch's to all the epistles of Virgil and the poems of Petrarch to all the poems of Cicero.[92]

Finally, declaring that Boccaccio's poetry and prose were composed "in the richest and most gracious manner," Niccoli concludes by affirming both his first and second positions as if they were somehow reconcilable.

---

[90] *Dialogi*, 83; 94.

[91] Ibid., 83; 94.

[92] Ibid., 83; 94 (slightly emended). Probably for years the remark had been a source of covert amusement among the younger men and now appears as an inside joke.

> When I read those ancients whom you [Salutati] have just mentioned (which I do as much as possible), when I consider their wisdom and eloquence, I am so far from supposing that I know anything – recognizing, as I do, the dullness of my own genius – that it seems not even the greatest geniuses can learn anything at this time. But the more difficult I think it, the more I admire the Florentine poets, who against the opposition of the times nevertheless by some superabundance of genius managed to equal or surpass those ancients.

As if they are hearing only the last words of this ambivalent statement, his listeners rejoice that he has returned to accord with them, and the dialogue comes to a close.

Given the backhanded tenor of Niccoli's discourse on the second day, Bruni leaves us in doubt about his own assessment of Niccoli's arguments on the first day. That early on in the *Dialogi* the persona Bruni is said to agree "in everything" with Niccoli proves unhelpful, because we must then presume that Bruni, like Niccoli, never really questioned the literary excellence of the Three Crowns. Just as we doubt Niccoli's sincerity, so we question Bruni's.[93] The authorial voice in the preface, however, provides us with some guidance. Here Bruni's conception of the progressive development of literary studies, from small beginnings to hope of distinctive achievement in the future, furnishes parameters for determining which opinions would be potentially acceptable to the author.

Bruni's description of the reviving but modest condition of literary studies down to his own time renders unlikely any position that would accept the superiority of Dante, Boccaccio, or Petrarch over the ancients or even their parity with them. It is in accord, however, with the kind of language that Niccoli uses in his self-rebuttal when he remarks of Petrarch that he "opened the way for us to be able to learn." It would also appear to underwrite as genuine the admiration that Niccoli expresses for what the Three Crowns were able to accomplish in the face of the adversities of their times. Finally, Niccoli's earlier insistence on the inferiority of the moderns to the ancients does not contradict the preface's expectation of significant literary achievement in the future. If "not inconsiderable," the quality of whatever might ensue might still fall short of the ancient models.

[93] Ibid., 62. The comment of the interlocutor Salutati reads: "Nam ego de Leonardo non dubito: ita enim video illum in omni sententia cum Nicolao convenire, ut iam arbitrer potius cum illo errare velle quam mecum recta sequi."

Consequently, while the *Dialogi* probably aimed at offering a realistic, generally negative assessment of the literary quality of the writings of the Three Crowns without openly offending popular Florentine sensibilities, modestly optimistic conclusions emerge, which in all likelihood reflect Bruni's own thinking. He surely intended the quality of his own writing in the text, moreover, to demonstrate that his optimism about the prospects of literature was justified.

One should not, however, be too preoccupied with ascertaining Bruni's "real" position on the issues in the *Dialogi*. The work's studied ambiguity, a dimension of the Ciceronian dialogue that Bruni endeavored to recreate, was obviously more important in constructing the work than any vindication of a particular position on the issues involved in the discussion. Much as his study of Cicero's orations had affected his conceptions of history and politics, so had his study of Cicero's dialogues affected his understanding of the ways in which truth should be articulated. A student of rhetoric, having learned that effective persuasion depended on presenting one's ideas in terms understandable to a particular listener, Bruni, nevertheless, refrained from stating the implications of Cicero's dialogue format for the nature of truth: that "truth," even when genuinely sought by the speaker as well as the listener, was often dependent on one's point of view. Reasonable men might disagree, and real advances in thinking could only be made when they agreed to disagree reasonably, seeking sincerely through discussion to establish the boundaries of their disagreement.

While oratory was concerned with definite questions that usually required immediate decisions, *disputatio* dealt with indefinite questions, such as the nature of good and evil, where, although ultimately conclusions might be reached, extensive discussion of the issues was possible and constructive.[94] In the *Dialogi*'s relaxed yet vibrant interchanges of opinions between friends striving to advance knowledge by collective examination of divers points of view, Bruni envisaged a means of capturing the variegation of mental activity and the problematic character of much of what passed for truth.

Oration encouraged *contentio*, a clash of opinion, while *sermo* or *disputatio* – as the humanists redefined the term – dramatized the leisurely, mutual pursuit of truth. Since the same men participated in

[94] Remer, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration*, 31–33.

both genres, though, the good habits of *sermo*, listening, withholding judgment, and being willing to reconsider one's thinking, could also have a modifying effect on the conduct of the *contentio* that was an inescapable fact of public life.

Symptomatic of the concerns of the first Ciceronianism was the *Dialogi*'s omission of the religious arguments that Salutati had used in defending the stature of Petrarch's writings and modern writers generally. Introduced into the Petrarch debate only in 1405–06 by Salutati, who was anxious to cancel out his own devastating assertion of the unquestioned inferiority of moderns to ancients in 1395, such arguments had no purchase with Bruni or with other members of the younger generation. These men were quite prepared to limit the investigation of truth to the world perceived by the senses, where, at best, probability and verisimilitude could be attained. In any case, Bruni would likely have felt awkward in expressing Christian ideas in the Ciceronian discourse he was developing.

Bruni's commitment to Ciceronian dialogue also entailed condemnation of Scholasticism's dialectical thinking, not only of its methodology but also of its cast of mind. Bruni knew his predecessor's traditional opposition to scholastic formulations of moral issues. Salutati's *De nobilitate medicine et legum* testifies to that man's ability to construct a theological argument in scholastic form, but the *De nobilitate* was exceptional among his discussions of religious issues. The attack in Bruni's first dialogue by the persona of Niccoli against the barbarian logicians as destroyers of dialectic would have been sympathetically received by Petrarch and Salutati alike.

The Scholastics' agonistic cast of mind, however, was difficult to eradicate. Petrarch had already spoken out in favor of freedom of opinion in all matters that did not relate to Christian doctrine, but the dialectical passions of Salutati, Petrarch's principal successor, demonstrated that the mentality of *sic et non* was not easily dislodged. Salutati liked nothing better than to expound and defend an opinion with all the tricks available to the debater.

Nevertheless, with his reconstruction of the Ciceronian dialogue Bruni succeeded in creating a novel, alternative space in European intellectual life where, free of overarching religious considerations, laymen could use a nicely balanced, nuanced language in amicable fashion to explore issues relating to their social and political lives. Encoded in this formulation of dialogue were norms of tolerance and goodwill that made harmonious life in republics possible. Whereas

Cicero's oratory played a vital role in helping Bruni formulate his conception of republicanism, Cicero's dialogues contributed to his vision of the kind of civil discourse that nourished the political life of the ideal republic.

Bruni's model for civil discourse, however, had little influence in practice. By his generation, the tradition of courtesy and respect characteristic of Trecento humanists in their relationship with one another was beginning to break down. Subsequently, the tradition disappeared. Although they developed their arguments in different ways, using a different kind of language, Quattrocento humanist rhetoricians proved just as disputatious as their Scholastic counterparts, and because often their altercations were barely concealed conflicts of egos, they merited less respect.

5

The principal achievement of Bruni's generation was to add a public or political dimension to humanism by classicizing oratory. Inspired by Cicero, Vergerio in the 1390s was the first to manifest a new interest in oratory as a focus for humanist study, but he failed to match the rhetorical power of his model. A decade later Bruni succeeded where Vergerio had failed, by molding his style into a generic imitation of Cicero's oratorical language that was startlingly different from the eclectic styles of preceding humanists. Subsequently, with equal success, Bruni captured both the style and the mood of Cicero's dialogues and, if less successfully, Cicero's "informal" letters. By laicizing the participants in his dialogue, moreover, Bruni opened up the possibility of extending humanist moral concerns to issues of childrearing, marriage, and civic duty – as Francesco Barbaro's *De re uxoria* would soon demonstrate. After 1400, then, humanists again pondered the kinds of issues that had been discussed a century before by Lovato and Mussato.

On Petrarch's initiative, religion had been yoked to humanism, and the force of his eloquence and personality brought the following generation along after him. Vergerio, by contrast, in his sermons on Jerome, demonstrated how even a saint's life could be praised for its ethical value almost independently of the usual hagiographical accoutrements of miracles and other divine interventions. Ciceronianism then carried Bruni beyond Vergerio, furnishing a sure means of

filtering out such accoutrements and constructing a morality independent of religious commitment.

In Bruni's hands, Ciceronian Latin became a powerful tool for separating the gamut of moral issues from Christian impingements, thereby valorizing the use of ancient wisdom for solving ethical problems. Since the thirteenth century, Christian theologians had offered conceptual schemes for distinguishing the temporal realm from the spiritual: Aquinas's world of nature and world of grace, for example, or the nominalists' *potentia absoluta* and *potentia ordinata*. But in each scheme, neither of the contrasting terms had meaning in isolation from the other. Even Marsilio of Padua had acknowledged the existence of a spiritual realm in delineating the parameters of secular authority. The limits of the language found in the Ciceronian texts favored by the humanists – the letters, orations, and dialogues on rhetoric and morals, the latter with their naturalistic conception of ethical conduct – tended to exclude transcendental preoccupations. Ciceronianism was a self-contained language game in which a whole range of medieval preoccupations could find no voice, because their expression lay outside the game's bounds.

The historian has no way of measuring the extent to which Bruni and other members of his generation reached out to Ciceronianism as a way of articulating their own concerns or to what extent intensive study of Cicero's writings had itself awakened those concerns. Witnesses to the papal schism and to the crassest abuses of spiritual weapons, Bruni's generation had every reason to look elsewhere than the Church for moral authority.[95] For children of such a storm, the focus on a moral life within a natural world, where ethical discussion could be directly informed by ancient precedent, must have offered reassurances.

Unbeknownst to Bruni's generation of humanists, they were giving voice to a secular orientation that had been latent in humanism from the beginning but that had been temporarily deflected by Petrarch's Christian stance. The absence of apparent religious concerns among the lay intellectuals of late-thirteenth-century Padua, Verona, and Vicenza was also continuous with the traditional secularism of medieval Italian rhetoric. The great difference between the secular learn-

[95] With rival popes claiming to be the true descendants of St. Peter, Salutati even worried about the efficacy of the sacraments (*Hercules*, 172). He remained concerned even though he must have been aware of Church doctrine on the issue.

ing of Bruni and other contemporary humanists and that of their thirteenth-century predecessors resided in the cognitive change that accompanied Ciceronianism. Although Lovati's poetry at times might have gestured in the direction of a naturalism more wide-ranging than anything of Bruni's, Bruni's Ciceronianism provided him with an integrated and self-consistent interpretive framework for his experience.

The new Ciceronianism was not only encouraged by secular tendencies of this generation of humanists, but also by the development of novel forms of political and social life. As we shall see, humanism increasingly found recruits among members of the Florentine patrician class who, wealthy, powerful, and possessed of leisure time, invited comparison with the cast of Cicero's dialogues. The political regime dominated by this class, eager to emphasize common civic goals in order to unify the citizenry, could identify with the political morality of the ancient republican statesman, who, stressing civic obligation and rational debate, fought almost singlehandedly to preserve the political authority of a republic riven by faction.

Note: Stefano U. Baldassarri's critical edition of Bruni's *Dialogi, Dialogi ad Petrum Paulum Histrum*, Istituto nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento, Studi e testi, no. 35 (Florence, 1994), only came to my attention when my manuscript was already in proofs.

CHAPTER TEN

THE FIRST CICERONIANISM

Having originated as part of grammar, not rhetoric, Italian humanism only began in 1315 to challenge the prevailing authority of medieval *dictamen*, which, with the exception of sermons and technical scholastic writing, exercised dominion over formal prose writing. *Dictamen* was a codified Latin that had developed beginning in the late eleventh century; it had to be dislodged from one genre of prose after another in something like a house-to-house campaign. In the late fourteenth century, classicizing prose still remained confined largely to literary rhetoric.

Humanists like Salutati lived with split personalities, using humanist language in their personal writing, *dictamen* in their public letters, and either *ars predicandi* or an adaptation of *ars arengandi*, both subsidiaries of *ars dictaminis*, in their speeches. While Petrarch had made an incongruous gesture toward reform by creating a highly personal oratorical form relying on medieval elements, Salutati showed himself willing to strive for eloquence within traditional structures of official rhetoric. The hold of medieval prose over rhetoric in the public sphere was only challenged late in the fourteenth century by professional teachers of rhetoric such as Cino Rinuccini and Giovanni Malpaghini and even then only subversively, from the safety of the classroom. The first to introduce classicizing rhetoric into the public arena was Pierpaolo Vergerio, inspired by his training under Malpaghini a few years earlier. Within little more than a decade, Vergerio's effort was seconded, with consummate artistry, by Bruni. Attempts in the fifteenth century to replace the highly codified, internationally recognized *ars dictaminis* in public correspondence had only mixed success, but the medieval Latin oratorical form appears to have succumbed quickly to the new Ciceronian one.

Already in the third quarter of the Trecento, probably in ignorance of Latini's earlier effort, Lapo and Gianfiglazzi were endeavoring to reform oratory, and with the introduction of *ekphrasis* into his own discourse, Lapo took a major practical step in that direction. As we shall see in this chapter, of the two men responsible for emphasizing the study of Cicero's own orations from the 1380s, at least one,

Rinuccini, a Florentine from an old family, considered it a patriotic act in a republican polity. Probably some of the Florentine grammar schools began using the ancient writers a few years before the schools of rhetoric decided to make the Ciceronian orations a subject of study, but it was the decision by the teachers of rhetoric that brought about a radical change in the student body in both schools. By making the Ciceronian oration the final stage in the educational curriculum, the humanists put a process in place for certifying boys for future roles as leaders in the city–republic. The educational reforms had only become possible, in turn, because the Florentine patriciate had come increasingly to subscribe to the claims made by the humanists for the training they supplied.

1

Early in the fourteenth century, with the exception of the few boys who would themselves become teachers in primary and secondary schools, those attending grammar school went on to become physicians, churchmen, or legal professionals (lawyers and notaries). Some of those men continued to maintain an interest in Latin literature, but only in their spare time. In Petrarch's Florentine circle, for example, along with two professional teachers (Bruno Casini [d. 1348] and Zanobi da Strada [d. 1361]), there were a notary, Francesco Bruni; a cleric, Francesco Nelli; and Boccaccio, who also had legal training.[1] If the typical rich Florentine, businessman–industrialist and civic leader, had any education beyond elementary school, at that time it would usually have been in the school of the abacus.

Recruitment for the schools had not changed much a generation or so later, in the 1370s, when the Augustinian friar, Luigi Marsili, and four notaries, Coluccio Salutati, Domenico Silvestri, Antonio ser Chelli, and Alberto degli Albizzi, formed the core of the humanist group in Florence. By about 1380, they received the young civil lawyer, Lorenzo Ridolfi, into their group.[2] Although not a member of the humanist circle, the youthful Angelo Pandolfini (1360–1446), who was destined to become a successful businessman and civic

[1] For Petrarch's Florentine circle, see above, 223.
[2] On Ridolfi, see above, 234.

leader, must have already been seriously cultivating the Latin letters that earned him the respect of Bruni's generation.[3] He was the first to challenge the grammar schools' focus on preparing students for the learned professions.

A harbinger of change, Pandolfini would be followed in the last two decades of the century by a number of other patrician youths who would ultimately enter commerce and industry. Some of those whose formal education was already completed in the fourteenth century, such as Palla di Nofri Strozzi (1372–1462) and the Corbinelli brothers, Angelo (1373–1419) and Antonio (1377–1425), perhaps gained their knowledge of ancient letters on their own initiative when young men.[4] But evidently by 1400, Florentine patrician fathers increasingly wanted their sons to have an education in ancient literature and history and sent them to schools of grammar and rhetoric. Legal professionals and career teachers, such as Salutati, Jacopo da Scarperia, Poggio Bracciolini, Leonardo Bruni, Pietro di ser Mino, Roberto Rossi, and Malpaghini, continued to play the guiding role in the humanist movement – only late in the fifteenth century would amateur Florentine humanists contribute substantially to scholarly work – but by the first years of the fifteenth century a number of the future leaders of the Florentine republic had received or were receiving training in ancient letters.[5] As Greek became avail-

[3] Lauro Martines, *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists, 1390–1460* (London, 1963), 313–14.

[4] Ibid., 316–20.

[5] Martines, *Social World*, 320–36, provides profiles of nine patricians born between 1380 and 1400 who were not in learned careers and yet were regarded as scholars:

(1) Jacopo di Niccolò Corbizzi, fl. 1415;
(2) Domenico di Lionardo Buoninsegni, 1385–1467;
(3) Niccolò di Messer Vieri de' Medici, 1385–1455;
(4) Lorenzo di Marco Benvenuti, ca. 1383–1423;
(5) Cosimo de' Medici, 1389–1464;
(6) Alessandro di Ugo degli Alessandri, 1391–1460;
(7) Lorenzo di Giovanni de' Medici, 1394–1440;
(8) Matteo di Simone Strozzi, 1397–1436;
(9) Angelo di Jacopo Acciaiuoli, 1397–ca. 1468.

He provides profiles for seven in learned professions born in the same period:

(1) Cristoforo Buondelmonti, fl. 1422, priest.
(2) Giovanni Aretino, fl. 1415, scribe.
(3) Antonio di Mario di Francesco di Nino, fl. 1417–61, scribe.
(4) Giuliano di Niccolaio Davanzati, 1390–1446, lawyer.
(5) Buonaccorso da Montemagno, ca. 1392–1429, lawyer.
(6) Guglielmo di Francesco Tanagli, 1391–1460, lawyer.
(7) Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli, 1397–1482, doctor.

able, some of the young men would add it to their Latin learning.[6]

The educational background of the families of Maso degli Albizzi and Giovanni di Bicci de' Medici exemplify this change. We know that as a young man, Maso degli Albizzi's younger son, Luca (1382–1458), became Poggio's pupil, only a few years his senior, in order to learn Latin literature, and that Luca later studied Greek with Rossi.[7] While nothing is known for certain of the formal training of Maso's older boy, Rinaldo (1370–1442), there is evidence that he, like his brother, had an interest in literary studies.[8] Bruni felt it appropriate to dedicate to him his Latin treatise on knighthood.[9] Rinaldo, in turn, tried to provide the best humanist education possible for his own two sons, Ormano (1398–ca. 1457) and Maso (1400–?), by hiring as their tutor Tommaso di Sarzana, the future Pope Nicholas V.[10]

I would add two other names to this list: Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) and Biagio Guasconi, to whom Francesco Barbaro directed his diatribe against Niccoli in 1413. On Manetti (1396–1459), see Heinz W. Wittschier, *Giannozzo Manetti: Das Corpus der Orationes* (Cologne, 1968), 1–49; on Guasconi, see Remigio Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini* (Catania, 1914; rpt. Padua, 1971), 30 and 37. Both were businessmen, although in Manetti's case scholarly interests came to occupy most of his time. Bibliography on Guasconi is found in A. Lanza, *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Rinascimento (1375–1449)*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1989), 187, n. 54; and Raffaella Maria Zaccaria, "Documenti di Biagio Guasconi e la sua famiglia," *Interpres* 11 (1991): 295–325. In his *Les marchands écrivains à Florence: Affaires et humanisme à Florence, 1375–1434* (Paris, 1967), 361–465, Christian Bec characterizes in detail the link between the vernacular and Latin culture of the merchants in this period.

[6] Roberto Rossi counted among his students of Greek Cosimo de' Medici, Domenico di Lionardo Buoninsegni, Bartolo Tedaldo, Luca di Maso degli Albizzi, and Alessandro degli Alessandri: Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Le vite*, ed. Aulo Greco, 2 vols. (Florence, 1976), 2:168. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, 31, adds Lorenzo, Cosimo's brother, to the list.

[7] Pompeo Litta, "Albizzi di Firenze," *Famiglie italiane celebre*, fasc. 176 (Turin, 1871), table 18, writes that at seventeen, barely knowing how to write, Luca "si dette segretamene sotto la direzione di Poggio Bracciolini suo amico e coetaneo" to studying Latin. Cf. A. D'Addario, "Albizzi, Luca," *DBI* 2 (Rome, 1960), 26. Luca's late start with his Latin education parallels that of Giannozzo Manetti, who was already 25 when he began studying Latin (Bisticci, *Vite*, 1:487).

[8] On the humanistic learning of Rinaldo, see Vittorio Rossi, *Il Quattrocento* (Milan, 1938), 34 and 124–26. For Rinaldo's biography, see A. D'Addario, "Albizzi, Rinaldo," *DBI* 2 (Rome, 1960), 29–32. Rinaldo copied a portion of Filelfo's *Orationum in Cosimum medicem ad exules optimates Florentinos liber primus*: BAM, V, 10 sup., 1437: Paul O. Kristeller, *Iter italicum*, 6 vols. (London, 1963–97), 1:315. A Latin letter in Rinaldo's name is found in the Universitätsbibliothek, Munich, 607, fol. 154 (ibid., 6:648b).

[9] C.C. Bayley, *War and Society in Renaissance Florence: The De militia of Leonardo Bruni* (Toronto, 1961), edits and comments on the text.

[10] Bisticci, *Vite*, 1:38 and 2:145.

Although Rinaldo's and Luca's father seems to have left his sons to get their humanistic education on their own, Giovanni Bicci de' Medici, the father of Cosimo (1389–1464) and Lorenzo (1394–1440), acted more providently with his. We have Cosimo's manuscript of the *Heroides*, purchased while he was still a schoolboy studying with the grammarian Niccolò di Duccio of Arezzo.[11] Both sons studied Greek with Rossi, and both maintained a Latin correspondence with the rich Venetian humanist, Francesco Barbaro.[12] Thus, Cosimo's creation of a large collection of manuscripts and his patronage of learned men stemmed in part from an interest cultivated in his youth. He, in turn, hired Filelfo as Greek tutor for his own son Piero.[13]

By the early years of the fifteenth century, then, humanists were on their way to becoming the prime educators of a significant portion of Florence's male patricians, and humanist education had begun to serve as a rite of passage for those claiming high social status in the city. For most patrician youth, the study of the classical authors did not constitute preprofessional training, but rather the last formal education that they would receive. To suppose that such learning would have been useless to them in daily practice is to overlook the status function that such learning had acquired, together with the close tie between family prosperity and political status in the republic.

The humanists had successfully convinced the city fathers that the literary legacy of antiquity possessed the indwelling power both to sharpen its students' intellectual abilities and develop their moral sensibilities.[14] Having internalized the teachings of antiquity, the young Florentine patrician was supposedly equipped to govern ethically and effectively. On the basis of that expectation, patrician fathers showed themselves willing to invest in the political future of

[11] James Hankins, "Cosimo de' Medici as a Patron of Humanistic Literature," in *Cosimo Il Vecchio de' Medici, 1389–1434: Essays in Commemoration of the 600th Anniversary of Cosimo de Medici's Brithday*," ed. F. Ames-Lewis (Oxford, 1992), 71. Hankins convincingly presents Cosimo as seriously interested in classical studies but as no real scholar (73–76).

[12] Only one letter of Barbaro to Lorenzo survives, *Diatriba praeliminaris in duas partes divisa ad Francisci Barbari et aliorum epistolas* ..., ed. A.M. Querini, 2 vols. (Brescia, 1741–43), 2:8–9, as well as one to both Lorenzo and Cosimo, 1:56–57. Other letters of Barbaro to Cosimo are found at 1:142–45, and in the appendix, 10 and 18–19.

[13] Later in life, Filelfo addressed Piero with these words: "Facisque ac fecisti semper pro officio gratissimo discipuli et viri optimi": *Francisci Filelfi Epistolarum summa* (Venice, 1515), *ad an.* 3 Aug. 1449.

[14] The humanist effort to link classical education with moral development was suggested by James Hankins, "Cosimo de' Medici as a Patron," 89.

their children by postponing the young men's entry into the business world for the time necessary to gain humanist credentials.

The "lessons of antiquity" did not consist simply of disembodied precepts for conduct but instead came packaged within a historical context that vivified their meaning and located them within a historical continuum that also included the contemporary world. The lessons' importance extended not merely to personal morality but to practical politics as well. The loyalty of medieval Italians to precedent had been reinforced by their consciousness of a mythical–historical pagan culture that somehow formed the backdrop for the present in which they lived. A hundred years of humanistic endeavors had given dimension to that vague conceptual scheme, establishing a sequence of historical events linking antiquity to modern times, and in the process defining conceptions of the pagan world.

Considering seriously the dictum that history provided lessons for the present, the humanists constructed a world of thought in which contemporary action became inseparably linked to Roman antiquity, which served as a source for interpreting present experience and for guiding the lives both of individuals and polities. In justifying his composition of *Historiarum florentini populi libri XII*, the history of his adopted city, Bruni succinctly described the high value he placed on such writing:

> These [historical] events seemed to me worthy of recording and memory, and I considered the knowledge of these things most worthy for private and public purposes. For since men who are advanced in age are considered wiser to the extent that they have seen many things in their lives, by how much more, if we have intelligently read history, in which the deeds and conceptions of many ages are discerned, are we endowed with wisdom, so that we easily understand what to pursue and what to avoid, and the glory of excellent men excites us to virtue?[15]

After seventy years of humanist imitative writing and philological investigation, the ancient world, in its oxymoronic relationship as other and like Trecento Italy, emerged fullblown in the work of

[15] *Leonardi aretini Historiarum florentini populi libri XII*, ed. E. Santini, *RIS*, new ser., 19.3 (Città di Castello, 1926), 3: "Haec mihi perdigna literis et memoria videbantur, ac earumdem cognitionem rerum utilissimam privatim et publice arbitrabar. Nam cum provecti aetate homines eo sapientiores habeantur, quo plura viderunt in vita, quanto magis historia nobis, si accurate legerimus, hanc praestare poterit sapientiam, in qua multarum aetatum facta consiliaque cernuntur, ut et quid sequare et quid vites faciliter sumas, excellentiumque virorum gloria ad virtutem excitare?"

Petrarch. Moving beyond the limited ambitions of the historical research of his predecessors, which had been primarily directed to writing contemporary history and formulating *accessus* for ancient authors, Petrarch aimed at understanding antiquity both as intrinsically interesting and as didactically important for contemporary life. His Christian commitment, however, continually intruded on his sympathetic assessment of ancient life and thought, and it determined both the focus of his interest in antiquity and his judgment as to its uses for the present. Primarily concerned with personal virtue, he gave little thought to creating a general conceptual framework for interpreting Roman history and culture.

His greatest disciple, Salutati, advanced the new Petrarchan historical consciousness by attempting to periodize selected cultural developments from antiquity down to the fourteenth century. But his most significant contribution occurred in his thirty-one years as chancellor of the Florentine Republic because it was in that capacity that he gave resonance to contemporary political policies and events by situating them relative to the contexts of the ancient and medieval past. Salutati's strategy in his *missive* of constructing historical matrices for current political events in order to amplify their significance had no antecedent. While he often sacrificed consistency of interpretation, which would have matched appropriate historical precedent with current policy, to the exigencies of dignifying Florentine self-interest, Salutati's official letters reached beyond the narrow circle of the chancery elite to a wide audience among the ruling class in Florence and even beyond. Shaping and stabilizing his society's amorphous relationship to the past, he led his Italian contemporaries to the realization that their own political life could be better understood when seen against a backdrop of events distant in time.

As we have seen, the shifting preference that Salutati showed in his official letters for ancient or medieval parallels not only represented his deliberate effort to find appropriate historical associations for the propaganda task at hand but also his ambivalence toward the pagan heritage. The admixture of ancient and medieval precedents in his official formulations of Florentine policy matched his contradictory appraisals of the pagan world and its heritage in his private writings. His belief that a divine plan guided human history, together with his efforts to envisage historical events within a secular framework, produced further tensions. Whatever Salutati's conflicting loyalties and shifting positions, however, the relevance of history to current affairs remained fundamental for him.

Filtering contemporary political experience through the linguistic grid of Ciceronian rhetoric, Bruni achieved the kind of consistent political and historical interpretive structure required by the contemporary patrician regime in Florence, which was groping for a way to conceptualize the new order emerging from the wreckage of guild politics. By joining the new rhetoric to practical politics, the ambitious Aretine scholar had already established his reputation by his mid-thirties.

To the Florentine patriciate around 1400, then, humanism had at least a twofold appeal: it certified that its students would emerge from the humanists' classroom morally improved and also better able to make informed judgments in matters of practical politics. The opening of the schools of grammar to a new kind of student with new motivations helps explain the emergence of oratory as a major component of the late Trecento curriculum and the corresponding emphasis on oratory and political debate in Florentine public life already noted in the last chapter.

As we have seen, the clearest indication of the new role of oratory in humanist education came not from Florence but from Padua, in the form of Vergerio's *De ingenuis moribus*, composed in 1402. The book, which soon became a basic text for students in the classroom, outlined Vergerio's educational program. For Vergerio, eloquence derived not from study of ancient poetic and prose writing generally, but primarily from the study of oratory. The central role that oratory played in Vergerio's scheme helps explain the stress that he laid on virtues connected with the active life in early works, such as the sermons on Jerome. Vergerio's program was clearly conceived for young men preparing to participate in public life.[16]

To give Florence its due in the development of the new oratorical emphasis, however, we must remember that, even if Vergerio was the first to embody oratory in a curriculum of study, he almost certainly drew on his experience in Florence in the 1380s. In his repeated visits to Florence thereafter, he would also have witnessed the growing numbers of young patricians enrolled in schools of grammar and rhetoric who in effect underscored the relevance of the educational program that he later formulated. Bruni's *Laudatio*, composed less than two years after Vergerio's *De ingenuis moribus*, offered superb

[16] See above, 377.

advertising for a humanist education based on rhetoric. Bruni's work not only dramatized the same active virtues praised by Vergerio, this time in a republican context, but also tacitly held out the expectation that the republican ethos idealized in the oration could be cultivated by studying rhetoric. Like Bruni, other students of rhetoric, informed by the training that they received, would emerge from school infused with the desire to be good citizens and equipped to participate in the give-and-take of republican politics. Somewhat later, Cino Rinuccini extolled rhetoric as "most useful to the republic" in that it taught students how to debate and reason in public assemblies, where the business of state was carried out.[17]

Drawing heavily on Cicero, Bruni's *Dialogi* provided the appropriate guide for such republican assemblies. In contrast with the dialectical (scholastic) model of medieval theological debate, which humanists in their own way had continued to follow in composing invectives, republican discourse manifested greater tolerance for conflicting opinion and strove for answers to problems through cooperative thinking. In a regime consciously cultivating consensus, a young patrician who displayed such a cast of mind showed his potential for leadership. Humanist education promised to instill the requisite outlook.

The effects of proclaiming contemporary Florence a re-creation of the ancient Roman republic, though, had practical limitations. Tuscan remained the primary language of public discourse in the internal and external life of the commune: fifteenth-century Florentine examples of classicizing Latin political oratory are largely confined to the work of professional humanists. Nor should we look for an immediate influence of the new Latin style on vernacular oratory. Humanists like Bruni adapted the periodic style to vernacular oratory relatively late, only in the 1420s.[18] In other words, training in ancient poetry, history, and oratory did not produce generations of toga-clad patrician senators eloquently debating the business of the republic in the Ciceronian periods that they had learned in school.

[17] In "Invettiva contro a cierti calunniatori di Dante e di messer Francesco Petrarcha e di messer Giovanni Bocaccio, i nomi de' quali per onestà si tacciono," ed. A. Lanza, in *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Quattrocento: Studi e testi* (Rome, 1972), 263, Rinuccini writes that rhetoric "è iscienza alla republica utilissima."

[18] Emilio Santini, "La produzione volgare di Leonardo Bruni aretino e il suo culto per 'le tre corone fiorentine,'" *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 60 (1912): 307–08 and 311–12.

What humanistic training did accomplish, however, was to render vernacular public discourse more literate and historically grounded. By the second decade of the fifteenth century, the Florentine patriciate was coming to approach current public policy within an extended historical context that privileged ancient Rome's political experience. Quotations from Roman authors, allusions to ancient historical events, and a concerted effort to attain historical perspective on the problems facing the city punctuated the debates of Florence's inner councils beginning in these years.[19] That the new mentality quickly bore fruit is evinced by the example of Goro Dati, a scholarly merchant of some political stature in the city, who between 1409 and 1411 framed his widely diffused account of the contemporary history of Florence in conceptual terms drawn from Bruni's *Laudatio*.[20]

Beginning in 1409 to 1411, moreover, one detects a new tolerance of opinion in the councils of state.[21] Increasingly, the regime relied on the advice of experts and endeavored to establish policy only after extensive debate. In an effort to gain widespread support for decisions, the city's governors indulged in longer speeches, in which they analyzed problems extensively and deployed fresh rhetorical techniques to persuade the unconvinced. In those speeches, historical and literary references played a key role. The debates suggest that in this period the Florentine ruling class was already conceptualizing politics along humanist lines.

---

[19] The sources for this paragaph and the one following are Gene Brucker, *The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence* (Princeton, 1977), 299–300; and idem, "Humanism, Politics, and the Social Order in Early Renaissance Florence," in *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations: Acts of Two Conferences at Villa I Tatti in 1976–1977*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and C. Smyth, 2 vols. (Florence, 1979), 1:3–11. Commenting on Hans Baron's thesis that a new consciousness of republican freedom emerged in Florence after 1402 and within a few years was widely shared by the Florentine patriciate, Brucker writes: "The evidence in these protocols [*Consulte e Pratiche*] ... does lend support to Baron's major thesis about the emergence in Florence of new views of history and politics in the first decade of the *quattrocento*" (300). As far as Baron's insistence on the external cause of the changed attitude, Brucker believes that internal developments were as important as threats from abroad in changing Florentine perceptions and points of view.

[20] Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in the Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, 1966), 145–60, 186, 316, 331–32, and 448, n. 14, discusses Dati's republican view of Florentine politics. On Dati, see references in P. Viti, "Dati, Gregorio (Goro)," *DBI* 33 (1987), 35–40.

[21] Brucker, *Civic World*, 299.

Respect for Latin oratory encouraged humanists to practice it even when they knew that the linguistic limitations of their audience would jeopardize understanding.[22] Granted, the diffusion of Latin education among the patriciate meant that more individuals in a public gathering would in principle have been able to follow a speaker's classicizing Latin than in previous decades. More than one patrician, however, must have sat through such performances scrambling to cobble together meaning from the scraps of the discourse that he understood. In any case, though, a Latin speech might draw applause even from those without pretensions to Latin literacy, if they perceived its cadences as celebratory music bringing honor to themselves and their city. The dawning realization among the Florentine patriciate that humanism was not merely the property of a professional elite coincided with a shifting emphasis within humanism itself and, consequently, initiated a development that within a few generations made humanist education essential training for the upper classes in urban centers throughout Italy.

Paradoxically, Florence's precedence in the change may have stemmed from the precocious importance of vernacular literature among the Florentine reading public. Although backward in enlisting in the classicizing movement, which took shape initially in Padua, other cities to the north, and Arezzo, Florence became the major center for translations of pagan Latin literature and history into the vernacular. By the late fourteenth century, therefore, even though few Florentines could read the original Latin texts, many more had read from the substantial corpus of moral, historical, and poetic works by pagan authors that, over the previous century or more, had become available in Tuscan translation. Aware of the value of the classical writings, even if their foreignness had been somewhat diluted by translation into a familiar language loaded with contemporary associations, the Florentines became generous patrons of humanism. The first in western Europe to give official support to a teacher of Greek in 1360–62, the Florentines were also the first, thirty-five years later, to take advantage of the presence of an eminent Greek scholar to renew the teaching of Greek in the peninsula. Salutati's thirty-one-year tenure as chancellor probably owed as much to the political leadership's respect for his learning as it did to

[22] The issue of whether a speech was originally given in Latin is discussed above, 361.

his political astuteness. The humanists, then, had an easier task in establishing their educational program among a patriciate who already knew many of the great texts and had some appreciation for their contents.

More specifically, Bruni's own version of humanism, with its emphasis on oratory, may have received support from residual memories of Brunetto Latini's legacy. The Florentine vernacular tradition of translation had been initiated by Latini, who privileged certain Ciceronian oratorical texts because he thought they might enhance the quality of vernacular oratory and hence the vitality of republican life. That civic virtue and eloquence were intimately related was a fundamental assumption of his thought. Through humanism, Bruni was able to provide conceptual clarity and a historical anchor for ideals to which Latini had aspired but which he had not fully been able to articulate.

2

Although a serious effort to trace the diffusion of humanist oratorical rhetoric from Florence to other centers of learning would require another book, the following pages seek to summarize how the new stylistic orientation fared, once it spread to two other major Italian cities, Venice and Milan. Whereas since the middle of the fourteenth century Florence had nourished a tradition of Petrarchan humanism that had laid the groundwork for the new humanism, in Venice, the movement, largely ignored by the patriciate, remained derivative and anemic down to 1400.[23] In its patrician phase in the fifteenth century,

[23] For Mussato's adverse opinion of the cultural atmosphere of Venice early in the Trecento, see 121–22, n. 11. About 1380, Paolo de Bernardo, an aspiring Venetian humanist who made a career of holding official notarial positions in the Venetian government, made roughly the same assessment. "Crede michi: in patria," he wrote, "quod invitus dixerim, nihil minus in precio quam studium litterarum" (L. Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell'umanesimo in Venezia* [Geneva, 1930], 219 [*Epist.* 26]). Petrarch's residence of over two years (January 1366 to March or April 1368) seems not to have been satisfactory for him. He found living in a republic awkward, and he also felt intellectually isolated in the city: Manlio P. Stocchi, "La biblioteca del Petrarca," *SCV* 2:555 and 559. If not a disinterested observation, Giovanni Conversini's scathing remark in 1404 that the Venetians treated education as they would a business proposition probably held a good deal of truth: Remigio Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna: Insigne figura d'umanista (1343–1408)* (Como, 1924), 194: "Vos haud aliter quam piperis crocive negotium sortimini litterarum." Within a decade of

however, Venetian humanism – Margaret King appropriately calls it "patrician humanism" – enjoyed a more vigorous existence.[24]

There have been two main explanations for the origins of patrician humanism in Venice. The first, the one connected with Hans Baron's theory of civic humanism, is not so much concerned with the initial interest of the patriciate in humanistic studies as it is in identifying at what point the Venetian humanists began to develop a political ideology. For Baron, they did so in the 1420s, when the election of Francesco Foscari as doge (1425) gave a new "Italian" orientation to Venetian foreign policy.[25] The subsequent war against Filippo Maria Visconti, beginning in 1425, when Florence and Venice, two republics, were united against an aggressive tyrant, produced a new appreciation of the connection between Venetian liberty and the independence of all Italian states.[26]

Among the many virtues of Margaret King's work on Venetian humanism is her analysis of the fifteenth-century phase of the movement in Venice in terms of three generations of humanists, beginning with the one maturing in the epoch that Baron identified as marking the birth of a new attitude to politics among the patriciate. Of sixteen men from that first generation (born between 1370 and 1399), fourteen enjoyed patrician rank, and six of the patricians did not have careers in learned professions, i.e., in medicine, the church, law, or the notariate.[27] In contrast to Florence, where the local leaders of the

---

Conversini's death in 1408, however, the achievements of Venetian humanism would render such negative judgments outmoded: Manlio P. Stocchi, "Scuola e cultura umanistica fra due secoli," *SCV* 3:115–18.

On Trecento Venetian humanism, besides the pioneering study of Lazzarini and the articles by Stocchi mentioned above, see especially Nicholas Mann, "Petrarca e la cancelleria veneziana," *SCV* 2:517–35; and his "Benintendi Ravagnani, il Petrarca, e l'umanesimo veneziano," in *Petrarca, Venezia e il Veneto*, ed. G. Padoan (Venice, 1976), 109–22. Also consult L. Lazzarini, "Dux ille Dandulus," in ibid., 123–56; and his "Francesco Petrarca e il primo umanesimo a Venezia," *Umanesimo europeo e umanesimo veneziano*, ed. V. Branca (Florence, 1963), 63–92.

[24] Margaret King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton, 1986), 299.

[25] Baron interprets the election as marking the triumph "of the same ideal of *libertas Italiae* which had first been hammered out in Florence under the impact of the struggle with Giangaleazzo" (*Crisis*, 343).

[26] Already before 1390, Rafaino Caresini had spoken of Venice as defending the liberty of Italian states (see below), but that gesture toward solidarity was something less than the situation in the 1420s required, when the formation of a league of republican states was being considered.

[27] King, *Venetian Humanism*, 315–449, provides an invaluable list of three generations of fifteenth-century Venetian humanists. The list of those in learned professions

movement, as we have seen, were scholars like Bruni and Poggio who came from Florentine territories, in Venice the leadership was largely in the hands of patricians from the city, one of whom, Francesco Barbaro, almost rivaled the two Florentines in fame. While humanist teachers such as Giovanni Conversini, Gasparino Barzizza, Guarino, and Vittorino da Feltre offered their patrician students excellent training, they contributed little specific to the character of Venetian humanism as it emerged from the first years of the fifteenth century.

While King offers a detailed description of early Venetian humanism by discussing individuals and their writings, it is not her concern to speak directly to the issue of the chronology of the amalgamation of politics and ancient letters within the first generation. She does provide a more likely explanation than Baron, though, for the attraction of the Venetian ruling class to humanism. In her view, the late fourteenth century marked the final consolidation of the leading families of Venice. The admission of thirty new families to patrician ranks in 1381 was not to be repeated. For King, humanism offered

---

in the first generation breaks down as follows (page references are to King):

Churchmen

(1) Fantino Dandolo (1379–1459), patrician;
(2) Pietro Donato (1380–1447), patrician;
(3) Pietro Vecchio Marcello (1376–1428), patrician;
(4) Pietro Miani (1370–1429), patrician;
(5) Fantino Vallaresso (ca. 1392–1443), patrician.

Notary

Jacopo Languschi (late 14th cent.–after 1465).

Lawyers

(1) Marco Lippomano (1390–after 1446), lawyer of both laws, patrician;
(2) Zaccaria Trevisan (ca. 1370–1414), patrician.

Medical doctors

(1) Leonardi, Niccolo (1370–1452);
(2) Tommasi, Pietro (1375/80–after 1458).

Nonprofessionals of the first generation (all patricians)

(1) Francesco Barbaro (1390–1454);
(2) Giovanni Corner (1370–after 1452);
(3) Leonardo Giustiniani (1389–1446);
(4) Andrea Giuliani (1384–1452);
(5) Jacopo Marcello (1398 or 1399–1464 or 1465);
(6) Daniele Vitturi (late 14th cent.–before Jan. 1441).

Although humanist groups in Venice and Florence were roughly the same size, the ratio of those in learned professions to those outside them was almost reversed (10:6 for Venice versus 7:11 for Florence). We cannot, however, be sure to what extent King's and Martines's criteria for qualifying an individual as a "humanist" correspond.

the generation rising to maturity at the turn of the century a way of conceptualizing the new order and anchoring its values in the bedrock of antiquity.[28]

She is not more specific about the elements involved in the consolidation of the governing class in the decades around 1400. But in support of her position, it should be pointed out that, together with the enlarged patrician class, another change occurred after the War of Chioggia (1378–81); a shift in leadership occurred within the ruling group which possibly created concerns about the patriciate's self-image. While the ranks of the patriciate swelled, the former patrician leadership, the *lunghi*, were replaced by the *curti*, a group of patrician families from which no doge had previously come.[29] Perhaps aided by the addition of thirty new families to the patriciate in September 1381, the *curti* in October 1382 elected one of their number, Antonio Venier, as doge. The *curti* dominated the office for the next 250 years. The change in the inner circle seems to have had an effect on foreign policy over the next few decades, as Venice extended its possessions in Greece, the Balkans, and the Aegean and Mediterranean islands. With the annexation of Vicenza, Verona, and Padua between 1404 and 1406, Venice also began building a mainland empire. Like Bruni and later Palmieri, Venetian humanists learned to use their skill to develop justifications for imperialistic projects.

Compared with the political tensions in Florence around 1400, however, those in Venice at the time appear minimal, and as we shall see, the fact that Venetians did not seem particularly eager to imitate Bruni's *Laudatio* casts doubt on whether the new inner circle felt obliged to justify its position by identifying itself with ideals that were regarded highly by literate Venetian society at large. In Venice humanism contributed minimally to political ideology: its major importance lay in preparing young patricians to take their place in the political life of the republic.

[28] "For this generation born in the late Trecento had as children witnessed the consolidation of the city's ruling class. At this critical moment in their history, they intercepted and appropriated the humanist movement. Humanism would reinforce and express the newly healed consciousness grafted on the inherited values of that class, which they identified with the interests of their city" (King, *Venetian Humanism*, 216).

[29] On the two political groups, see S. Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, 10 vols. (Venice, 1853–69), 4:420. This paragraph is based on Frederic C. Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic* (Baltimore and London, 1973), 196–98.

As in Florence, the Petrarchan inheritance required modification if it was to meet the demands of a ruling class. Both republican cities required a version of humanism that was secular in orientation and that emphasized the virtues of the active life of the citizen within a republican framework of government. That no traces of a transformation of Petrarchan humanism in the fourteenth century are found in Venice suggests that the transformation there involved the importation of the new oratorical humanism from Florence, where it had originated.

Zaccaria Trevisan appears to be the first Venetian patrician to have introduced oratorical humanism to Venice.[30] The ennoblement of his family in 1381, after Chioggia, made possible for the eleven-year-old Zaccaria a previously unthinkable career in politics. That the family were *arrivistes* may have helped motivate Trevisan to distinguish himself for learning. As a student of law in Bologna, he first met Vergerio in 1390, and while evidence is fragmentary, their friendship appears to have continued until Trevisan's death.[31]

[30] No speeches by a Venetian patrician are known to me before this. T. Casini, "Notizie e documenti per la storia della poesia italiana nei secoli XIII e XIV: 1. Tre nuovi rimatori del Trecento (Appendice)," *Propugnatore*, n.s., 1, no. 5 (1888): 313–66, lists eleven speeches in BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 5223, as well as four translations of short ancient Greek speeches (fols. 71–72). Apparently copied in Venice soon after 1410 (on the basis of the last datable item in the work), the manuscript contains two Latin orations from 1407 and from 1409/10 composed by Venetians, and a third, a short, undated rhetorical exercise (fol. 74v), also probably by a Venetian. The speech of 1407 (fols. 66–67v), *Sermo editus per Laurentium Monacis cancellarium Crete in celebritate exequiarum nobilis viri Domini Vitalis Lando*, was delivered on October 17, 1407, six months after Trevisan's oration: P. Poppi, "Ricerche sulla vita e cultura del notaio e cronista veneziano Lorenzo de Monacis, cancelliere cretese (ca. 1351–1428)," *Studi veneziani* 9 (1967): 178, n. 132. The second (fols. 137–38), *Lauri Bragadini oratio coram pontificem maximum*, is clearly addressed to Alexander V, elected pope in 1409. For a discussion of the compiler, see Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo*, 155–56. Dates or approximate dates from the 1390s are assignable for eight of the eleven speeches; all except Zanobi da Strada's speech on fame written in 1355 (fols. 116–21) were presumably composed between the early 1390s and 1410.

[31] The basic work on Trevisan remains Percy Gothein, *Zacharias Trevisan: Leben und Umkreis* (Amsterdam and Antwerp, 1944). Because the German text was not available to me, I used the Italian version, published two years earlier: *Zaccaria Trevisan il Vecchio: La vita e l'ambiente* (Venice, 1942). Vergerio probably met Trevisan in Bologna in 1390, because the following spring, now in Padua, Vergerio, apologizing for the delay in sending the letter that he had promised at their first encounter, declared how grateful he was that in the intervening period Trevisan had repeatedly sent greetings to him through friends: Vergerio (*Epist.*, 60). Gothein's discussion of the letter is found in his *Zaccaria Trevisan*, 9–11.

While no further correspondence has survived to show their continued contact, references in Vergerio's later letters to mutual friends point to a longstanding friend-

Having established a successful career as a teacher of law in Bologna, Trevisan was nominated by the commune of that city in 1394 to fill a vacancy created by the recent murder of the patriarch of Aquileia but he did not receive the post.[32] Disappointed in his hope for high ecclesiastical office, Trevisan married within a year and resolved to make a career in politics.[33] In February 1398, Trevisan gave up his academic career to become *podestà* of Florence, where, having finished the usual six-month term, he was reappointed for a second one. In the spring of 1399, he accepted a year's appointment as senator of Rome. After serving as papal ambassador to Florence in April 1400, he returned home to Venice, where he began a cycle of officeholding that continued until his death in 1414.[34]

Nothing is known of Trevisan's early education. His first surviving piece of writing dates from March 1407, when, retiring as Venice's first captain of Padua after the destruction of the Carrara regime and turning over his office to his successor, Pietro Raimondo, he delivered an oration.[35] If Vergerio's enthusiasm for Ciceronian oratory had initially alerted Trevisan to its importance, we may assume that his contact for a year with Salutati's circle as an official of the Florentine republic and then his exchanges of letters with his Florentine friends led him to see how effective oratory could be in the service of a political agenda.[36]

---

ship. A letter of Almerico da Serravalle in 1412 (Vergerio, *Epist.*, 347–48) informs Vergerio that Trevisan does not want Vergerio to return to Rome but to come to him (presumably in Venice) once Trevisan has returned from his office in Illyria. In reply, Vergerio remembers Trevisan's many kindnesses to him: "cuius quidem promptissimum erga me animum cum ex aliis multis antehac ...." (ibid., 348). Vergerio will delay writing to Trevisan about coming until the latter is back home. In 1417, Vergerio recalls how impressed he was with the young Francesco Barbaro when, years before, Trevisan had shown him one of his letters (361). So Gothein is clearly wrong when he maintains (*Zaccaria Trevisan*, 11) that Vergerio's relationship with Trevisan "finì in niente."

[32] *Epistolario di Pellegrino Zambeccari*, ed. L. Frati, in FSI, no. 40 (Rome, 1929), 151–53. Cf. Gothein, *Zaccaria Trevisan*, 12. The translated quotation in Gothein assigned to letter 137 (pp. 152–53) comes from letter 139 (p. 154): "... ceteros in eadem legum lectura concurrentes scolarium in numero dupliciter antecedit et maius nomen habet et famam, quam aliquis doctor in Studio nostro degens."

[33] Gothein, *Zaccaria Trevisan*, 21–22.

[34] Gothein narrates the events of the years 1398–1400 (ibid., 22–43).

[35] The speech is published by Gothein, "Zaccaria Trevisan," *Archivio veneto* 21 (1937): 28–30.

[36] The only letter surviving, however, from Trevisan's subsequent contact with the Florentine group is Salutati's of August 25, 1399 (Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:349–59).

Judging from internal evidence, Trevisan's oration was delivered before a large audience, presumably including professors and students of the university. Eager to justify the recent Venetian takeover of the Carrara state, Trevisan praised his replacement for his virtue in order to reassure the Paduans that they would enjoy a greater measure of liberty and justice under Venice than they had under their former rulers. Perhaps for the sake of originality, he avoided using the topos of humility in his opening remarks and began by saying that, given the numerous virtues and talents of Raimondo, he would mention only those that were unique to the new captain. Rather than be a *laudator*, he said, he would be an *admirator*, by which he may have meant that he genuinely believed what he was saying and was not merely praising Raimondo out of duty.[37] While in no way attaining Bruni's level of diction, Trevisan's prose did reflect a conscious effort to imitate ancient periodic style. The first period of the oration was remarkably successful:

> Tuas acturus laudes, sublimis vir, non est unde ausim eas vetusto saltem dicendi genere in hoc celebri coetu litteratorumque frequentia pro ipsarum amplitudine tuisque in me sempiternis meritis meoque affectu permaximo posse conficere.[38]

The period opened with a future periphrastic dependent on the archaic perfect *ausim*, which in turn depended for the completion of its meaning on the two infinitives at the end of the period. The period was divided into only two main clauses, *Tuas ... frequentia* and *pro ... conficere*, balanced by paralleling three ablatives in the second clause, *pro ... amplitudine*, *tuisque ... meritis*, and *meoque ... permaximo*, with three in the first clause, *vetusto ... genere*, *in ... coetu*, and *litteratorumque frequentia*. The medieval penchant for superlatives remained in *permaximo*; *sublimis* used in the apostrophe was unclassical. On the whole the periodic structure was respectable.

Trevisan's syntactical problems began in the second period, where he attempted to freight his structure with more subordinate clauses than he could handle. The result was to clutter his ideas and render his meaning largely unintelligible to most of his listeners.

---

[37] Kenneth Gouwens has suggested this interpretation to me.

[38] "About to praise you, Oh exalted man, there is no way that I would dare to be able to do so in the traditional way before this celebrated company and multitude of learned men on account of their number, your unceasing merits in my regard, and my profound affection." The Latin text is in Gothein, "Zaccaria Trevisan," 28.

(1) Intuenti namque mi(c)hi insignes animi tui dotes,
(2) quas tibi parens natura indidit, tuque felicis in morem agricolae accuratissime coluisti,
(3) non dicam omnes (quis enim illas complecti queat) sed ex innumeris eas excipiens
(4) quas tibi proprias peculiaresque censui, humanitatem ac clementiam tuam, rerumque agendarum publicarum maxime, quibus sedulo versaris, peritiam,
(5) et cum in cunctis integritatem animi tui tum in his quae ardua horrendaque existimantur mentis tuae fortitudinem atque constantiam,
(6) sat pretium operae actum arbitrabor, si admiratoris officium non laudatoris munus implevero.[39]

Whereas Trevisan evidently intended to highlight Raimondo's personal virtues, *humanitas*, *clementia*, *peritia*, *integritas*, *fortitudo*, and *constantia*, the series was so broken up by modifying clauses that the effect was to obscure them. In other words, the relative, the accusative noun, and the two demonstratives (*quas*, *omnes*, *illas*, and *eas*), linking *intuenti ... dotes* to the virtues, made it difficult to follow the logic of the construction. The complicated syntax also impeded the author's obvious concern to create tension by introducing contrast (*non ... omnes ... sed* and *si ... officium ... non ... munus*) and balance by using parallel clauses and paired nouns (*quas ... tuque*; *cum ... tum ...*; *humanitatem ... clementiam*; and *fortitudinem atque constantiam*). The main verb of the period, *arbitrabor*, on which (1) *Intuenti* ... and (5) *et cum* ... depended, was dwarfed by what came before.[40] The analysis of this period exposes the difficulties that Trevisan encountered in mastering the new style and should enhance our appreciation of Bruni's stylistic achievement in the *Laudatio*.

[39] "For when I survey the outstanding gifts of your mind, which our parent nature gave you and which you, like a successful farmer, cultivated diligently – I should not say all your gifts (for who can embrace them), but selecting from the innumerable ones those that I thought peculiarly yours, your humanity and clemency and especially your skill in performing public duties, in which you are intensely involved, and both the integrity of your mind in all things and the fortitude and constancy of your spirit in those matters which are deemed difficult and frightening – I will consider what I have accomplished worthwhile if I shall have fulfilled the office of admirer and not that of panegyrist."

[40] An allusion to Livy's *Praefatio*, 1 ("Facturusne operae pretium sim") would not, however, have escaped the learned among his audience.

While only a qualified success, Trevisan's use of periodic oratorical style appears intended to ennoble the art of governing and to indicate that the Venetians have the loftiest motives for their rule. Indirectly referring to the recent defeat of the Carrara, Trevisan proclaimed that the greatest service that man could render to society was to resuscitate "neglected laws, give life to silent rights, consult for the safety of citizens, promise and award gifts to the good, ward off evil men from the walls of the *patria* and its sacred shrines, and repel injuries from us and all our children, and finally render cities peaceful."[41] Those who did as much in ancient times, he declared, were made into gods.[42]

Praising Raimondo for his virtues and urging him to maintain the Paduan people in justice and liberty, Trevisan pointed to the tie that had bound the Paduan and Venetian peoples together for eight hundred years, until "the tyrants invaded this kingly city," that is, Padua. The goal of the Venetian government, he concluded, was not to punish and repress the citizens, but rather to benefit them. Implicitly demonstrating the importance of classicizing oration for conducting the activities of public life and expressing political ideas, Trevisan served as a bridge between the first Ciceronianism in Florence and an emerging Ciceronianism in Venice. Although we have no evidence save the oration itself, Trevisan probably imported as well the imitative principle that made Cicero's orations the model to be emulated.[43] The way had been prepared in Venice, as it had in Florence, by decades of humanists' insisting that training in the classics improved morals and that the study of ancient history provided military and political insights. Oratorical training now offered the patrician an opportunity to apply wisdom acquired through knowledge of the classics to practical political problems, while at the same time publicly displaying his high moral character in the mirror of eloquence.

Trevisan's efforts were reinforced by the teaching of Gasparino Barzizza (1360–1431). Modern scholars recognize Barzizza as the

[41] Gothein, "Zaccaria Trevisan," 29.

[42] Trevisan has not yet gotten his historical precedents in proper republican order. He includes the Caesars among those raised to divinity as benefactors of the people: "Caesares plurimos divinitate donatos legimus ...."(ibid., 29).

[43] That Trevisan's three other surviving orations were delivered before ecclesiastics – one in December 1407, before the Roman pope; a second early in 1408, before that pope's Avignonese rival; and a third in 1413, before Pietro Marcello, bishop of Padua – might help explain these works' looser, more paratactic construction. The speeches are published in Gothein, "Zaccaria Trevisan," 34–49.

leading Ciceronian of his generation, although nothing is known of his interest in Cicero before 1407, when he arrived in Venice after eight years of teaching in Bergamo and seven years in Pavia.[44] In 1412, Barzizza referred in a letter to a manuscript of Cicero's *De oratore* that he had owned five years before; by 1408 at the latest he had a manuscript of *Ad Atticum*; and at some time before 1410 he claimed to have a copy of Loschi's manuscript containing twenty-one orations of Cicero, to have bought seven besides (actually duplicates of seven in the Loschi collection), and to own Loschi's *Inquisitio*.[45]

Appointed almost immediately after his arrival in Venice in 1407 to teach at Padua, Barzizza devoted his first lessons to Seneca's correspondence. The next course that he is known to have taught dealt with Cicero's orations, but that was five years later, in the school year 1412–13. A request on March 4, 1412, to Francesco Barbaro for the return of his copy of Loschi's *Inquisitio* was probably connected with preparing those lectures on Cicero: Barzizza explained that he needed the work so as not to disappoint the expectations of his friends.[46] That he needed to consult Loschi's text may mean that this

[44] R.G.G. Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza with Special Reference to His Place in Paduan Humanism* (London, 1979), provides a general discussion of Barzizza's teaching and contribution to humanistic studies. For what is known of Barzizza's teaching at Pavia, where he finished his doctorate in 1392, see Eugenio Garin, "La cultura milanese nella prima metà del XV secolo," in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 6 (Milan, 1955), 573–75. For the early letters, see Remigio Sabbadini, "Delle nuove lettere di Gasparino Barzizzi," *Rendiconti del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere* 62 (1929): 881–90; and Ludwig Bertalot, "Die älteste Briefsammlung des Gasparinus Barzizza," in *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, ed. Paul O. Kristeller, 2 vols. (Rome, 1975), 1:32–102. Dieter Girgensohn, "Gasparino Barzizza, cittadino padovano, onorato dalla Repubblica di Venezia (1417)," *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 19 (1986): 1–15, summarizes details of Barzizza's life while teaching at Padua.

[45] Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, 64 and 79, for *Ad Atticum* and *De oratore*, respectively. For the speeches, see the letter written to Daniele Vitturi: *Gasparini Barzizii bergomatis et Guiniforti filii opera*, ed. Giuseppe A. Furietti, 2 vols. (Rome, 1723), 1:206: "Habui clarissimas orationes Marci Tulii numero XXI praestantis viri Antonii Lusci. Emi praeterea septem, non tamen diversas: desunt ex omni numero totidem; festino tam ad eas exscribendas, quam ad legendas .... Habeo sententiam Antonii in undecim dumtaxat ...." Daniela Mazzuconi, "Per una sistemazione dell'epistolario di Gasparino Barzizza," *IMU* 20 (1977): 235, dates the letter as "prima 1410."

[46] *Gasparini Barzizii ... opera*, 1:146: the letter is dated March 4, 1412. In this letter to Barbaro, Barzizza asks for the return of his Loschi and his Plutarch. He needs both: "est enim utraque res mihi pernecessaria, si volo satis a me factum esse expectationi eorum, qui me non solum amant, sed etiam magno studio colunt." Cf. Remigio Sabbadini, *Studi di Gasparino Barzizza su Quintiliano e Cicerone* (Livorno, 1886), 9.

was his first effort to lecture on Cicero's oratorical writings. His desire to report the enthusiastic response of his audience, among whom were prelates and learned men, to his lectures over the following months is another indication that this may have been his first series of lectures on the subject.[47] It may well have been Barzizza's lectures that inspired Sicco Polentone (ca. 1375–1446/8), chancellor of the Commune of Padua, to publish the following year his own commentary on sixteen Ciceronian orations not covered by Loschi's *Inquisitio*.[48]

Barzizza composed an enormous number of orations, of which over seventy-five survive.[49] But his reputation rests primarily on two major works: his *De compositione*, written between 1417 and 1422, and his *Epistolae ad exercitationem accommodatae*, a collection of model letters for school use.[50] More careful in avoiding medieval Latin vocabulary than either Bruni or Poggio, skillful in using antitheses and other rhetorical colors, sensitive to clausal rhythm, Barzizza wielded a rhetoric rooted in Ciceronian precedents. At the same time, stressing that meaning dictated form, Barzizza made it clear that he was not slavishly Ciceronian. In Barzizza's hands, Ciceronian rhetoric lost whatever political associations it had possessed in Bruni's.[51]

---

[47] *Gasparini Barzizii ... opera*, xxx: "Augentur in dies auditores, etiam partim prelati et docti viri me, virtute sua, libenter audiunt. Instatur cum magno fervore quod orationes legam ....": cited from Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, 93, with no reference. I was unable to find the citation in Barzizza's letters.

[48] Arnaldo Segarizzi, *La Catania, le orazioni e le epistole di Sicco Polentone, umanista trentino del secolo XV* (Bergamo, 1899), xl–xli, discusses Polentone's *Argumenta super aliquot orationibus et invectivis Ciceronis*.

[49] Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, 104.

[50] Sabbadini, *Storia del Ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della Rinascenza* (Turin, 1885), 13–17, discusses Barzizza's Ciceronianism. Of Barzizza's *De compositione*, Sabbadini writes (14): "Per essere libro grammaticale è dettato con una correttezza ed un'eleganza, che invano si chercherebbero nelle stesse *Eleganze* del Valla." Of Barzizza's model letters, Sabbadini remarks (16): "... vi è una correttezza, una scrupolosità, di cui prima del Barzizza non si hanno esempi e ben pochi anche dopo di lui, finchè non si arriva a Paolo Cortesi." For the date of the *De compositione*, see Remigio Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini veronese* (Catania, 1896), 73. G.W. Pigman III has edited the treatise in "Barzizza's Treatise on Imitation," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 44 (1982): 341–52. Although in the *De compositione* Cicero is the main model for imitation, Barzizza recognizes that other authors can be imitated, without mentioning any specific names: G.W. Pigman III, "Barzizza's Studies of Cicero," *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 21 (1981): 124–25.

[51] Whereas in the *Cicero novus*, Bruni stressed Cicero's political life, Barzizza in the *Vita Marci Tulli Ciceronis* concentrates on Cicero the writer: Pigman, "Barzizza's Studies," 122 and 140. Pigman edits the work (ibid., 146–63).

While Barzizza may only have given his first public lectures on Cicero's oratory in 1412, that should not be taken to mean that his interest in Cicero was directly inspired by Florentine humanism. If while studying at Pavia before leaving to teach at Bergamo in 1392, Barzizza had not yet met Loschi, he must have come in contact with him on his return to Pavia in 1400. It may have been Loschi who turned him toward Cicero's speeches. Despite the republican ambience of Padua, where he would teach for more than two decades, Barzizza remained faithful to his Lombard inheritance, ignoring the potent political associations that Cicero's speeches carried. Having been rendered politically innocuous, Ciceronianism was ready to be diffused throughout the peninsula.

Andrea Giuliani, a close friend of Trevisan's and one of the first disciples of Barzizza, threw himself into the study of Cicero's orations as a young man, having come to understand their importance for practical politics. Born of a patrician family in 1384, Giuliani was twenty-three when he began the serious study of Latin letters under Barzizza. Although he also studied with Guarino after the latter's arrival in Venice in 1414, Giuliani had by then completed most of his education. As Venetian treasurer of Padua in 1412–13, Giuliani must have attended Barzizza's lecture course on Cicero's speeches. When Giuliani returned to Venice in 1413 at the age of twenty-nine, he decided to offer a course on the Ciceronian texts there.[52] Although the lessons took the form of university lectures, they were probably not given in a regular classroom, because Giuliani lacked an official appointment to teach. Instead, he would have delivered them in a hall, church, or private residence before his fellow patricians, the *patres clarissimi*, who must have wanted to know more about Cicero's style.[53] As for Giuliani himself, given his lifelong devotion to the Venetian state, we have no reason to doubt that what he taught would serve the interests of his city:

[52] Sabbadini, "Dalle nuove lettere di Gasparino Barzizzi," 883; and Sigfrido Troilo, *Andrea Giuliani, politico e letterato veneziano del Quattrocento* (Genoa and Florence, 1932), 174.

[53] Giuliani is probably speaking the truth when he says in the opening paragraph of his oration that "quod tamen onus non tam automate quam ut voluntatibus vestris adductus libenter assumam": *Oratio super principio orationum M. Tullii Ciceronis*, ed. K. Müllner, in his *Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pädagogik des Humanismus* (Vienna, 1899; rpt. Munich, 1970), 116–18.

> There is nothing, O most distinguished fathers, that the gods could grant me that would be more desirable than that today they should give me such force and analytical power that I may expound to you the divine eloquence and art of these orations of our Cicero ....[54]

From the outset of the discourse, Giuliani appears to have understood oratory to be equivalent to rhetoric, as had Vergerio also. Perhaps neither man would have excluded from rhetoric other genres of prose or even poetry, but both seem simply to have assumed that the prime vehicle for achieving eloquence was public discourse. Drawing on Cicero, *De oratore*, I.14, Giuliani strove to impress on his audience the centrality of oratory in human life:

> For who does not feel that at length all the arts and disciplines ought to seek aid and council from this one art? For what fruit could mathematics, natural or moral sciences, or law, what finally would all sciences have furnished us, were eloquence absent? All would be a desert; and no wonder, for nature divides us from the beasts by two very important things, that is, speech and reason, but man from man by speech.[55]

His brief outline of his lectures to follow – all of which are lost – indicates that he depended heavily on Loschi's *Inquisitio* for his own analysis.[56]

We have seen that by 1412, the rhetorical revolution initiated in Florence had been taken up by members of the Venetian patriciate and by Barzizza at Padua, a great teacher of Cicero who was devoted to propagating Cicero's style not only in the composition of orations but in all kinds of prose writing. The devotion of the Venetian patriciate to humanistic studies was, however, limited. Giuliani was one of the most accomplished young patrician scholars, yet in addition to his introductory discourse on Cicero, his surviving corpus only consists of three other orations, two letters, and an index of names to Eusebius's *Chronicon*. All but the last were written before or in 1415,

---

[54] Ibid., 116: "Nihil est, patres clarisimi, quod mihi dii immortales optabilius largiri potuissent, quam ut hodie tantam vim ac rationem dicendi mihi dedissent, ut harum orationum Ciceronis nostri divinam eloquentiam atque artem vobis exponere valerem ...." Cf. King, *Venetian Humanism*, 4.

[55] *Oratio*, 117: "Quis enim non sentit omnes artes atque disciplinas oportere auxilium consiliumque ab hac una tandem expetere? Quid enim mathematicae artes, quid naturales, quid morales, quid leges, quid denique scientiae omnes remota eloquentia fructus nobis praestitissent? Deserta omnia essent; nec mirum. Duabus enim maximis rebus a beluis nos natura seiunxit, oratione scilicet et ratione, ab homine vero hominem oratione."

[56] The observation is made by Troilo, *Andrea Giuliani*, 177.

when Giuliani was only 31.[57] True to the credo of his class, scholarship for Giuliani could never be more than an avocation in later life, despite his evident talent and interests. Almost until his death in 1455, Giuliani engaged ceaselessly in council meetings and ambassadorial missions, where his rhetorical gifts must have served him well but where there was little time for scholarship. The scholarly career of the even more talented Francesco Barbaro (1390–1454) followed much the same path.[58] Devoting most of his youth to the study of Latin and Greek, having produced Latin translations of Plutarch's *Aristides* and *Cato major* in 1415, and having written a humanist bestseller, *De re uxoria*, in 1416, Barbaro became a senator in 1419 at the age of twenty-nine and renounced his scholarly ambitions.

Because the first generation of patrician humanists viewed their education in practical terms, they did not produce many ambitious scholarly works. Their practical interests, moreover, did not immediately extend to using their learning as a way of dramatizing the republican character of their political institutions. As I have suggested, the increase in the number of Venetian noble families after Chioggia, the *curti*'s monopoly on the dogeship, and the government's shift toward more imperialistic policies did not lead the *lungi* into bitter opposition to the regime. The traditional identity of a

[57] The earliest oration, *In laudem corporis Jesu Christi* (1408/09), is published in Troilo, *Andrea Giuliani*, 200–02; the second, a speech before the doge, *Pro civibus veronensibus apud Thomam Mocenigo Venetorum ducem* (1414), remains in manuscript (Troilo, *Andrea Giuliani*, 186); and the third, Giuliani's most famous, *Pro Manuelis Chrysolorae funere oratio* (1415), is published in Angelo Calogerà, *Raccolta d'opuscoli scientifici e filologici*, vol. 26 (1741), 328–38. It should be noted that the oration praising the body of Christ, written a little over a year after Giuliani began studying with Barzizza, is the effort of a neophyte in Latin composition. A fifth oration, on the death of a family member, Paolo Giuliani, now lost, was composed in 1416 (Troilo, *Andrea Giuliani*, 184–85). Giuliani's two early letters to Barzizza are found in ibid., 193–96, and Remigio Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, 172. An index of names to Eusebius's *Chronicon*, entitled *Andreae Giuliani veneti viri consularis atque admodum dissertissimi in Eusebium tabula*, is in BAV, *Ottob. Lat*, 473, fols. 76–83. Troilo, *Andrea Giuliani*, 174, rejects the attribution to Giuliani of a translation of Cassius Dio.

[58] For bibliography on Barbaro's works, see King, *Venetian Humanism*, 323–25. His earliest oration (1412), of which only a part of the preface remains, is found in Bib. Angelica, Rome, 1139, fols. 117v–18 (Percy Gothein erroneously gives 118–19). For the date and a description of the oration, see Gothein, *Francesco Barbaro (1390–1454): Frühhumanismus und Staatkunst in Venedig* (Berlin, 1932), 32–33. The speech for the doctorate of Alberto Guidalotto, dated 1414, is found in Francesco Barbaro, *Diatriba praeliminaris in duas partes divisa ad Francesci Barbari et aliorum ad ipsum epistolas*, ed. J.M. Rizzardi, 2 vols. (Brescia, 1741–43), 2:162–67, and that on the death of Giovanni Corradini (1416), ibid., 2:156–161.

patriciate based on membership in the *Gran Consiglio* remained unchallenged, discouraging the reconceptualization of other power relationships within the city as well. Besides, that Venice had risen independently amidst the ruins of the Roman Empire was a source of civic pride.[59] As a result, mythical identification with republican Rome did not inspire Venetians as it did Florentines.

As these considerations might lead us to predict, statements of a theoretical nature are hard to find in Venetian writings in the first half of the fifteenth century.[60] Of the two most notable, one, Lorenzo de Monacis' *Oratio de edificatione et incremento urbis Venetae* (1420/21) was not the work of a member of the Ciceronian generation. The last representative of traditional chancery humanism, Monacis (1351–1428) expressed his ideas in oratorical form, but true to his early training, he did so in a style typical of the previous century. By contrast, the other theoretical work, Leonardo Giustiniani's *Funebris oratio ad Georgium Lauredanum* (1438), had a Ciceronian sheen.

Monacis' theoretical work was likely inspired by Bruni's *Laudatio*; Giustiniani's very possibly by Bruni's *Oratio in funere Johannis Stroze equitis florentini*. Just as Bruni combined themes already found in Salutati's public writings, Bruni's Venetian counterparts brought together a series of ideas previously articulated by Raffaino Caresini (1314–90), grand chancellor of the Venetian republic from 1365 until his death, in his official history of the republic, written late in the fourteenth century. Unlike Bruni's work, both the Venetian works

[59] This point has been made by William Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), 87–88. Apparently no use was made of Gregory VII's reference to the "libertate, quam ab antiqua stirpe Romane nobilitatis acceptam conservastis": *Das Register Gregorii VII*, ed. Erich Gaspar, in *Epistolae selecta*, *MGH*, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1916–52), 2:342; cf. Gina Fasoli, "Nascita di un mito," in *Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino Volpe*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1958), 2:460.

[60] One such theoretical statement, a justification of Venetian rule over its subject cities, is found in a *missive* sent by the commune of Brescia to Duke Filippo Maria Visconti in early March 1439, at the height of the Milanese siege of Brescia that took place from late June 1438 to April 1439. Written by Francesco Barbaro, then Venetian captain of the city, the Brescian *missive* constituted a response to a demand for surrender written by Pier Candido Decembrio in the name of the duke of Milan. In the process of rejecting the proposal, Barbaro briefly described the Venetian government, seen from the side of one of its subject cities. The theoretical implications of Barbaro's description are not undeveloped in the letter. On Barbaro's authorship, see Gothein, *Francesco Barbaro*, 231. Gothein discusses the war and Barbaro's role in it, ibid., 192–252. The letter is published in full in *Evangelistae Manelmi vicentini commentariolum de obsidione Brixiae anni 1438* (Brescia, 1728), 41–43.

focused singlemindedly on Venice, praising it patriotically while drawing few implications about republicanism in general.[61]

In continuing Andrea Dandolo's *Chronica brevis*, which the late doge had carried down to 1342, Caresini created a very different sequel: (1) abandoning an objective language, he wrote history as if arguing a case in court; (2) at points he drew parallels from ancient history and cited aphorisms from pagan literature; (3) whereas Dandolo went beyond Venetian territory only when forced to do so by the demands of his narrative, Caresini provided some sense of Venice's place within the wider political order; and (4) Caresini's narrative technique was to offer episodic reflections on the meaning of events.[62]

---

[61] Lorenzo notarized documents under Caresini in Venice between 1383 and 1386 and left the city to take up his appointment in Crete early in 1390: M. Poppi, "Ricerche sulla vita e cultura del notaio e cronista veneziano Lorenzo de Monacis," 172. The *Oratio de edificatione et incremento urbis Venetae* is published in Mario Poppi, "Un'orazione del cronista Lorenzo de Monacis per il Millenario di Venezia (1421)," *Atti dell'Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti 131 (1972–73): 484–97. Poppi, "Un oratione," 468–71, illustrates the connections with Bruni's work.

Giustiniani's oration is found in *Ad C.V. Georgium Lauredanum funebris oratio*, in *Orazioni, elogi e vite scritte da letterati veneti patrizi in lode di dogi, ed altri illustri soggetti*, ed. G.A. Morin, 2 vols. (Venice, 1795–96), 1:12–20. The evidence for Bruni's influence on Giustiniani is less conclusive and rests on the contrast between Giustiniani's surviving funeral orations for two of Venice's military heroes: Carlo Zeno in 1418 and Giorgio Loredan twenty years later. In the earlier oration, acknowledging that praise of an individual's country and family heightens his glory (*Ad Herennium*, II.6.10), Giustiniani explains that for the sake of brevity he will not speak of either but rather concentrate on the dead man's virtues and actions: *Funebris praestantissimi viri Leonardi Iustiniani: Pro Carolo Zeno Oratio*, ed. G. Zonta, *RIS*, n.s., 19.6 (Bologna, 1941), 141. Cf. John M. McManamon, *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism* (Princeton, 1989), 88–91. In the oration of 1438, Giustiniani used the opportunity to praise the Venetian republic (13–15), just as Bruni, in a similar situation, had praised Nanni Strozzi a decade before. Giustiniani's contacts with Florence were frequent. See his letters, for example, to Ambrogio Traversari: *Ambrosii Traversarii generalis camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum et ab alio de eodem Ambrosio latinae epistolae*, ed. L. Mehus (Florence, 1759; rpt. Bologna, 1968), 999–1003.

[62] See the *Chronica brevis*, ed. Ester Pastorello, *RIS*, new ser., 12.1 (Bologna, 1938–58), 351–373. Essential to the study of Dandolo's chronicles is G. Arnaldi, "Andrea Dandolo doge–cronista," in *La storiografia veneziana fino al secolo XVI: Aspetti e problemi*, ed. A. Pertusi (Florence, 1970), 127–268. The work of Caresini is found in *Raphayni de Caresinis, Cancellarii Venetiarum Chronica a 1343–1388*, ed. Ester Pastorello, *RIS*, new ser., 12.2 (Bologna, 1922). See also Lidia Capo's discussion in Girolamo Arnaldi and Lidia Capo, "I cronisti di Venezia e della Marca trevigiana," *SCV* 2:290–307. For a chronology of the development of the work, see A. Carile, "Caresini, Rafaino (Raffain, Raphainus, Raphaynus, Raphael de Caresinis)," *DBI* 20 (Rome, 1977), 82. Carile provides a detailed biography of the chancellor (80–83).

Throughout, Caresini envisaged Venice's historic role as providential, its actions guided by the divine hand. Upholders of the faith, enemies of pirates and the Turks, both of whom they fought at their own expense, Venetians were also the defenders of liberty, not only their own but that of everyone: they "guard the sea at their own expense against Turks and pirates for the Catholic faith, for the protection and liberty of all" (23).[63] Venice, Caresini claimed, offered refuge to anyone seeking to gain liberty (31); but, because non-Italians were commonly referred to in the work as *barbari* and enemies of Italian freedom, it seems likely that such refuge would only have been extended to Italians. Caresini incidentally drew a parallel between Venice and Rome in its most vigorous period – without being specific about the chronology – and compared Carlo Zeno's daring attack on Genoa in the summer of 1381, while the Genoese were pressing on Venice in the Adriatic, to Scipio's opening of a second front in Africa while Hannibal threatened Rome.[64]

In some of Caresini's themes, especially that of *libertas Italie*, we are probably hearing echoes of Salutati's *missive* from the years of the War of the Eight Saints (1375–78). In his official capacity, Caresini would no doubt have been aware of the eloquent formulations of Florentine foreign policy that Salutati had made five to eight years before Caresini began his own work, about 1383. Like Salutati, Caresini never integrated his republican themes into a concise statement of republican theory but allowed them to spring up by association as he wrote. We have seen that republican ideas were circulating in early fifteenth-century Venice, and consequently the Venetians would not have needed to be awakened to their republican heritage by the Florentines in 1425, as Baron believed they had been. By the same token, as I have suggested, we should not discount an earlier Florentine influence on Caresini himself, by way of Salutati's *missive*.

Furthermore, already four or five years before 1425, Monacis'

[63] Referring to Genoa's subjection to the Visconti in 1353, Caresini wistfully remarked that the city now existed "with free status lost, which ought to be regarded as dearer than life" (7). When he described how the Carrara had attempted in 1372 to assassinate important Venetians, he upbraided the Paduan people for their ingratitude to Venice, which twice before had liberated them from tyranny (21).

[64] "Romae, cui, cum floruit, urbs nostra in regimine et moribus simillima esse dignoscitur, triumphabat qui virorum quinque millia una acie prostravisset, etiam si non omnes gladio perirent, seu captivi minime ducerentur ...." (49). The comparison with Scipio occurs at 55.

Oratio de edificatione offered his own adaptation of Bruni's *Laudatio*, drawing not only on Bruni but also on Caresini. Essentially an appeal to the doge to arrange a celebration of the one thousandth anniversary of Venice's founding, the *Oratio* invoked the precedent of the Roman emperor who had ordered a celebration for Rome on a similar occasion in its history.[65] In contrast to Rome, however, whose freedom until its final destruction was constantly threatened and sometimes lost for long periods, Venice had enjoyed its liberty without interruption for a millennium. Running through a list of other enduring empires, Monacis concluded that "none have maintained their freedom for a thousand years" save Venice (485). Created by Divine Will in the midst of the barbarian invasions, Venice had become a haven for those seeking refuge from the destruction of their homeland, and in time a mixture of refugees had become one people under a doge (486–87). Because of its divine foundation, Venice remained "a place free, most secure, and most loyal to God," to which people unfairly oppressed might flee (490). Like Bruni in Florence, Monacis praised his city's site and climate. Venice was protected by swamps from attack, and yet, because of its maritime location, it had become an emporium for the East and West alike (493). The Adriatic tides, bringing in fresh water and carrying out bad, warded off pestilential vapors and kept the air pure from infection.

Monacis recounted how Venice's earliest doges undertook the protection of traffic on the seas and declared war on piracy. In time, Venice became so well-known as a defender of justice that cities came to plead for Venetian help in defending their rights and "many not only willingly but with petitions came under Venetian authority" (494). Foregoing an account of Venice's history of military victories – for this, he recommended his own forthcoming *De origine Venetiarum: De vita, moribus, et nobilitate Venetorum* – Monacis focused on the republic's recent victory in the province of Friuli against the combined forces of Friuli, Tyrol, Gorizia, and a Hungarian army (495–96). In conclusion, Monacis begged the doge once again to celebrate Venice's anniversary so that God, who had guided the destiny of the city for a thousand years, would assist contemporary Venetians in surpassing or at least equaling the glorious works of their ancestors (497).

[65] *Oratio de edificatione*, 484. Subsequent page references to this work are given in the text.

The antecedents of most of Monacis' ideas are clear. Involved with the Venetian chancery in the 1380s, Monacis must have known Caresini's *Chronicon* and mined it for his *Oratio*. Writing in the same loosely structured, old-fashioned Latin as Caresini, Monacis followed his former superior in presenting Divine Providence as the prime mover in Venetian history, making divine intervention omnipresent since the beginning of the city's existence. Caresini may also have inspired Monacis' theme of Venice as the citadel of liberty ready to protect the liberty of other peoples, and Caresini's brief mention of the city as "a refuge for anyone" may have induced Monacis to echo him. Monacis could also have found both themes in Bruni.[66]

Caresini's work clearly did not influence (1) Monacis' use of both the Venetian historiographical tradition and his own interpretation of universal history to argue that Venice alone of all states had enjoyed a thousand years of liberty; and (2) Monacis' stress on the desire of other peoples to enjoy the benefits of Venetian rule, thereby implicitly justifying current Venetian imperialism. Most important, Monacis, unlike Caresini, integrated old and new themes to create a political ideology. Here Bruni's writing doubtless provided the model. Monacis, however, missed Bruni's underlying theoretical point in the *Laudatio*: that the character of a society is shaped by its political structure. While Monaci praised Venetian liberty and power, he did not set Venice's republican constitution at the center of his analysis of the city's greatness.

Although writing in the new Florentine style, Leonardo Giustiniani constructed a similar political identity for Venice in his funeral address for the war hero, Giorgio Loredan, in 1438. Like Bruni a decade before in that man's funeral oration for Nanni Strozzi, Giustiniani took advantage of the ancient rules for panegyric by including a praise of Venice as a way of adding luster to Loredan's name. At the outset Giustiniani confessed himself uncertain whether he or any orator could praise the dead man sufficiently:

> For who would dispute that the man who, for the glory of his city, would deny the will to live, a natural desire in all living beings, is above any manner of praise? Because he deems life of little importance, he

[66] *Laudatio*, 251. In his *Dragmalogia* of 1404, Conversini had his Venetian interlocutor stress this aspect of Venetian generosity: *Dragmalogia de eligibili vite genere*, ed. and trans. H.L. Eaker (Lewisburg, Penn., 1980), 228.

> prefers for good reasons to die in office, rather than live with his *patria* humbled and dishonored.[67]

This hero's future fame, Giustiniani continued, derived not only from his own deeds but also from the glorious family and city to which he belonged. Giustiniani then turned to praising Venice, which, unlike other cities, was not created by human effort upon the land but rather by divine decree on the water:

> by divine decree, the nature of things themselves bowed to that city, which, among the waves of the sea and in the midst of whirlpools, erected so many churches, so many palaces, so many magnificent buildings, towers, shipyards, and ports, that they could have embellished many cities.[68]

To situate the city so conveniently in relationship to surrounding regions, open to commerce on all sides and yet defended by the natural walls of the sea from attack, could only have been the work of God.[69]

Through Venice's efforts, the seas were safe, and people seeking a homeland for themselves were free to come to the city, where after a time they might become its legitimate sons. Venetians never began wars or injured others, and, because justice was the very basis of the state, they aimed above all to be absolutely just.

> For although almost all other parts of a noble character could be called values of private individuals, this one belongs to the man worthy of command and empire ....[70]

No element in the community was favored over another; instead, by consulting in common, everyone received equal attention. For that

---

[67] Giustiniani, *Ad C.V. Georgium Lauredanum funebris oratio*, 12: "Nam qui cunctis insitam animantibus vitae cupiditatem pro gloria civitatis abjecerit, et parvi sane duxerit, cumque officio potius ac honestissimis rationibus emori, quam vel tenui patriae ignominia vivere maluerit, quis non eum omni dicendi genere superiorem esse contenderit?"

[68] "Huic autem Dei imperio ipsarum rerum natura cessit, quae inter maris fluctus, et medios pelagi vortices, tot templa, tot regias, tot magnificas aedes, turres, navalia, porticus extulit, ut multarum ornamenta urbium esse possint" (13).

[69] Compared with the following passage, a thoroughly secular discussion of life of the deceased and of the eternal fame that he has won, Giustiniani's talk of the city's providential foundation strikes a discordant note. The association was traditional, however, and Giustiniani's strong religious feelings are known.

[70] "Nam cum ferme ceterae partes honestatis privatorum bona, haec una principatu, et imperio digni hominis dici potest" (14).

reason, in the memory of man no factions had troubled the peace of the city, so that alone it had enjoyed uninterrupted rule over a wide territory.[71]

If Venice had been slow to go to war, its forbearance did not denote timidity:

> no fear, no loss, no threat has been able to frighten it from taking up arms against barbarians and other nations on behalf of its safety and that of its friends, or of its own or their dignity, fortune, or authority.[72]

Venice was like Hercules, son of Jove, who fought for the good of all, clearing the earth and sea of monsters. The city's many wars, ancient and recent, all capped with victory, testified that Venice never fought for selfish motives or ineffectively. At this point, having spoken of the honor that Loredan derived from his identification with Venice, Giustiniani moved on to praise Loredan's family and finally the dead man himself.

With conciseness and elegance, Giustiniani reformulated themes that he had drawn from his predecessors in a statement of Venetian political ideals befitting contemporary standards of taste. While nothing was really new in what he said, the classicizing form and language of the presentation weighted his words with an intensity and vigor foreign to the styles of Caresini or Monacis. If, as seems likely, he took Bruni's funeral oration as a model for exploiting the potential of epideictic oration, he did not, however, follow Bruni in adducing an intimate connection between the splendid achievements of his city and its republican regime.

A comparison of the development of Ciceronianism in Florence and Venice in the first half of the fifteenth century, then, requires a revision of Margaret King's explanation for the Venetian patriciate's attraction to humanism: that it afforded them the means for conceptualizing the new political order of the city. Given the strong sense of institutional continuity going back to the city's foundation in the dark days of the Roman Empire, the Venetians did not need a new ideol-

[71] "Quae res adeo civiles discordias, et populares omnino seditiones avertit, ut huic dumtaxat civitati post hominum memoriam sine factionibus intestinis contentionibus tam immensum, tam diuturnum gerere licuerit imperium" (14).

[72] "Ut autem veneta gens bellis inferendis semper tardissima extitit, sic ab armis pro sua amicorumque salute, dignitate, fortunis, imperio in barbaros, aliasque nationes suscipiendis, nullus ea terror, nulla jactura, nullum discrimen absterrere potuit" (15).

ogy, nor did the new understanding of the republican life of ancient Rome have much connection with Venice's own antecedents. Bruni's exploitation of the classical epideictic form of oration provided a model for the Venetians, but his Venetian imitators discarded his ancient Roman republican trappings.

As I have interpreted the progress of humanism in Venice here, the principal attraction of the first Ciceronianism lay in the focus of its educational program on moral fitness and eloquent speech. Those virtues had the same practical value for patrician families in Venice that they had for their counterparts in Florence. To the extent that humanist education became a rite of passage for young upper-class men, King is certainly correct that humanism enhanced social cohesion. Compared with the Florentines, though, the Venetians constructed a vision of their city's power and prestige that accorded only a limited role to republican institutions and made no effort to establish a specific link between the character of the government and the city's achievements. The potentiality of exploiting the "mixed constitution" of the republic would only belatedly be understood in the last half of the fifteenth century. In the first decades of the fifteenth century, the Venetian regime was not beset by political threats that could spur innovation, and local humanists, doubtless acquainted with Bruni's *Laudatio*, felt no pressure to respond exactly in kind on behalf of their own city.

I have noted the importance of Florentine intellectual influence on Venice over the decades: Salutati on Caresini; Bruni on Trevisan, Monacis, and Giustiniani. When an ordered conception of Venetian history and politics did emerge, however, independent Venetian thinking asserted itself. Even in its most Ciceronian guise, in Giustiniani, *laudes Venetiarum* promoted a conception of a divine providential scheme in which Venice enjoyed a specially favored place. The first Ciceronians of Venice created a Venetian ideology that offered little basis for political theorizing beyond the lagoons.[73]

[73] In his *De praestantia virorum sui aevi*, the Florentine chancellor, Benedetto Accolti, praised the Venetians for having united stability with justice and liberty: "Hi [the Venetians], postquam semel liberi esse inceperunt, pari tenore, eisdem semper vixerunt legibus; eadem in civitate instituta perdurarunt, ut novam certe Lacedaemonem existimare posses." More than any other people, the Venetians had demonstrated with their political success, according to Accolti, Cicero's dictum that "sapientia sine eloquentia parum prodest civitatibus": cited from Eugenio Garin, "Cultura filosofica toscana e veneta nel Quattrocento," in *L'umanesimo europeo e l'umanesimo veneziano*, ed. Vittorio Branca (Florence, 1963), 11.

3

In 1421, an anonymous writer, presumably a disciple of Barzizza, anticipated the effect that Barzizza's move from Padua to Pavia would have on the cultural life of the Visconti empire. After extolling the effects of eloquence on military skill, the arts, government, and virtue, the anonymous writer opined that, had eloquence been prominent earlier in Milan,

> your Milanese city would have enjoyed the countless benefits of letters, and it would not have been difficult for it to ward off the many dangers that it has suffered.[74]

The writer congratulated the duke for having realized the close tie between oratory (*ars oratoria*) and a flourishing political community.

> For since we see Florence flourishing magnificently in this art of speaking well, thanks to Leonardo Bruni, a most eloquent man, and also Venice and Padua, on account of Gasparino of Bergamo, a man endowed with the highest genius and greatest learning, by how much more will you Milanese flourish on account of that dignity by which your most flourishing city excels other cities.[75]

In fact, however, while the last decade of Barzizza's life in Milan was an exciting period of philological achievement in the city, the brilliant era of oratory prophesied by the writer never came.

We would not expect otherwise in a society that had no place for public speech. Even though Barzizza had developed a Ciceronian rhetoric severed from ideological associations, the public dimension of the humanist movement, so attractive to Florentine and Venetian patricians, had little to say to the great merchant families of signorial cities, politically marginalized as they were.[76] Only with time, as hu-

---

[74] BMV, *Lat.*, XI, 3 (4351), fol. 82v: "Nam hec vestra mediolanensis civitas tot litterarum commoditates fuisset assecutaque ei difficile non fuisset contra multa pericula que passa fuit conflixisse."

[75] The Latin reads: "Nam cum videamus Florentiam per Leonardum Aretinum virum eloquentissimum; Venetias vero atque Paduam propter Gasparinum Bergomensum summo ingenio summaque doctrina exornatum in hac benedicendi arte maxime florere: quanto magis vos Mediolanenses pro ea dignitate qua hec vestra civitas florentissima ceteris civitatibus antecellit" (ibid., fol. 82). Cf. Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, 133.

[76] Little work – perhaps justifiably – has been done on the literary interests of Milanese patricians in the early fifteenth century. Ezio Levi, *Francesco di Vannozzo e la lirica nelle corti lombarde durante la seconda metà del secolo XIV* (Florence, 1908), 235, notes that the will (dated December 22, 1394) of Marco Carelli, one of the richest mer-

manistic education came to be identified generally with high social status, would humanism find a significant number of adherents in the cities outside the learned professions.

In the first half of the fifteenth century, even professional humanists at the Visconti court showed no inclination to share in the enthusiasm for Ciceronian oratory that was seizing their counterparts in republican centers. Uberto Decembrio (ca. 1370–1427), the most regular humanist presence in the Milanese court of the period, wrote few speeches, and those few showed no sign of the influence of Ciceronian oratory.[77] While doubtless well-schooled in oratory, Uberto's son, Pier Candido Decembrio (1399–1447), who in the next generation played a role at the Visconti court similar to his father's before him, was not comfortable writing in the oratorical genre.[78]

---

chants in Milan, mentions only three books: "... in mezzo alle sue infinite masserizie non possedeva che tre libri, due offiziuoli, l'uno latino e l'altro volgare, e un volume miniato: *qui apelatur Liber floris virtutum cum quodam quaterno cum eo anexio descripto in Lucino De vitiis et virtutibus*."

[77] The best summary of his life is found in James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Leiden and New York, 1991), 1:105–07. For the life of Uberto's son, Piero Candido, see ibid., 117–19.

[78] In their official positions, both Decembrios were expected to compose and deliver orations. Of Uberto's, however, I have seen one complete oration, *De adventu Martini V pontificis* (1418), as well as the *incipit* and *explicit* of a second, presumably delivered before the cardinals at Constance. Both works are contained in BAM, 123 sup., fols. 235v–37 and 235–35v, a manuscript probably compiled under the direction of Uberto's family. See the description of the codex by R. Sabbadini, *Classici e umanisti da codici ambrosiani* (Florence, 1933), 85–94. A third oration is found in Biblioteca Civica, Bergamo, *Sermo factus per d. Ubertum Decembrem ad messam novi sacerdotis*, Lambda.I.20, fols. 47v–48, which I have not seen.

The traditional character of Uberto's oratorical style can be gathered from a few of the opening lines of his speech before the pope (123 sup., fol. 235): "Gaudiose admodum plurimi adventum atque presentiam sanctissimi domini nostri pape, respectu multiplici prestolati, varie solemnizant. Mercatores namque et artifices, ut mercimonia et eorum opera diligenter expediant. Clerici ut aliquid nove gratie prebende vel ecclesie sortiantur. Vulgus nurus et pueri ut solemnia videant et insolitos apparatus. Barbitonsores et coci, ut lucra et luxum solitum consequantur. Pauci hi sunt qui anime sue iusta et debita piacula concipiant ut veniam humiliter postulent de commissis."

Only two speeches survive for Pier Candido. The first, a funeral oration for Niccolo Picinini, is found in *Panegyricus P. Candidi in funere illustris Nicolai Picenini ad cives mediolanenses*, ed. Felice Fossati, *Opuscula historica*, *RIS*, new ser., 20.1 (Bologna, 1935), 991–1009. By its length and narrative quality the work seems more a biography than an oration. On the *De laudibus Mediolanensium urbis in comparationem Florentie panegyricus*, see below. Pier Candido should also probably be credited with writing the oration delivered by Ambrogio Crivelli to the Genovese in 1435: P. Argelati, *Bibliotheca*

The last fifteen years of Giangaleazzo Visconti's reign had witnessed a flood of promonarchical political writings unmatched in the reigns of his predecessors. No doubt to some extent stimulated by Salutati's learned attacks on Visconti "tyranny," vernacular poets and Latin humanists, some at the court and others seeking Visconti patronage, churned out numerous poems and letters praising the Visconti lord as *giusto signore* and *il Messia* and likening him to Caesar and Alexander.[79] A just and courageous monarch, his goal was to destroy his tyrant enemies and restore liberty to Italy.[80]

Although usually appearing separately and sometimes only by implication, three themes emerged from this literature. The most com-

---

scriptorum mediolanensium, 2 vols. (Milan, 1745), 2.2, col. 1764. Decembrio's *Declamationes*, written in the 1440s, apparently sparked by Barbaro's letter in the name of the Vicentine people (see above, n. 60), has not survived (Hankins, *Plato*, 1:140). The theses of the *Declamationes* are described in a letter of Alfonso of Cartegna (ibid., 2:590–92).

Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, 133, has Pier Candido along with his brother Angelo studying with Barzizza. The presence of Barzizza in Pavia in the 1420s makes it probable that Pier Candido would have known the orations of Cicero. Nevertheless, absence of their influence in Decembrio's writings led Ernst Ditt ("Piero Candido Decembrio: Contributo alla storia dell'Umanesimo italiano," *Memorie del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere* 24.2 [1931]: 87) to observe: "Sembra che le Orazioni di Cicerone, benchè ne esistessero nel XV secolo numerosi manoscritti, fossero quasi sconosciute al Decembrio. Soltanto la *De imperio Cn. Pompei* trovo citata una sola volta nell 'Invettiva' sul Carmagnola, contro Guarino ...."

[79] Saviozzo da Siena refers to the "Novella monarchia, giusto signore": cited in A. Medin, "Letteratura poetica viscontea," *Archivio storico lombardo* 12 (1885): 570. This kind of comparison appears frequently. See, for example, the words of an anonymous poet, "Roma vi chiama 'Cesar mio novello,'" cited in Nino Valeri, *La libertà e la pace: Orientamenti politici del Rinascimento italiano* (Turin, 1942), 75. Pietro Cantarino da Siena's poem on the duke's death refers to him as "un nuovo Ottaviano," canto 1, ottava 33, published in *Catalogo dei Mss. italiani della Biblioteca nazionale di Firenze descritti da una società di studiosi sotto la direzione del prof. A. Bartoli*, 4 vols. (Florence, 1879–85), 3:127. Among the cities which call out for Giangaleazzo's lordship in the *Cantillena pro comite Virtutum*, Francesco Vannozzo has Rome exclaim: "Donque correte ensieme, o sparse rime/ e zite predigando in ogni via/ ch'Italia ride et è zunto 'l Messia" (*Le rime di Francesco di Vannozzo*, ed. A. Medin [Bologna, 1928], 275, lines 14–16). A sonnet by Braccio Bracci in 1387 refers to the Visconti prince as "un santo" (E. Sarteschi, *Poesie minori del sec. XIV* [Bologna, 1867], 35). In the first edition of *Crisis* (Princeton, 1955), 451–52, Hans Baron provides a general bibliography on this literature.

[80] In his *Cantillena* (*Le rime di Francesco di Vannozzo*, 267, lines 15–16), Vannozzo writes: "l'altre se gettan tutte en le tuo' braccia/ perchè tiràn giamai non le disfaccia." Again on 269, lines 5–6, he has: "Ma perchè tu disfacci ogni signore/ che'l bel terren lombardo ha guasto e strutto ...." Giovanni Mazzini in 1388 refers to the Paduan conquest as a liberation: *Miscellaneorum ex Mss. libris bibliothecae Collegii Romani Societatis Jesu*, ed. Pietro Lazzero, 2 vols. (Rome, 1754), 1:173–74.

pelling and widely cited advantage of Visconti rule lay in the promise it brought for peace and justice to Italian cities, fractured by factionalism and often involved in open civil war. Second, conveniently forgetting Visconti negotiations for a French alliance, Milanese publicists presented their lord as the defender of Italian independence, in contrast to the Florentines who, in their effort to advance their power, had desperately sought foreign help where they could. Finally, the presence of so many learned men, virtuous and wise in council, at Giangaleazzo's court was used as evidence that the lord sought the best course of action for the commonweal. Closely related to the third theme, a fourth, identifying the Visconti princes as sponsors of vast building projects, only emerged in the decades after Giangaleazzo's death.[81] Writing in Latin and the vernacular, publicists orchestrated the four themes by reference to ancient historical models. None of the publicists' compositions, however, can be interpreted as in any way theoretical; focused solely on the virtues of Visconti rule, they offered no systematic conceptual justification for monarchical government.

Given Florentine claims to the superiority of their republican political life and their identification of Visconti rule with tyranny, quick and massive counterdeclarations might have been expected from Milan beginning in the early years of the fifteenth century, claiming superiority for monarchical rule and particularly that of the Visconti princes. The fact that no such counterdeclarations appeared may be ascribed in the first instance to the rapid dissolution of the Visconti state and the political instability of Milanese power down to 1415. But even after that date, the Milanese court seems to have shied away from a propaganda battle against its Florentine enemies.[82]

---

[81] In his *Dragmalogia*, 128–30, Giovanni Conversini points out this advantage of monarchy.

[82] Luigi Osio, *Documenti diplomatici tratti degli archivi milanesi*, 3 vols. (Milan, 1864–72) publishes most of the surviving *missive* of the Milanese chancery for the Visconti period. The *missive* never offer theoretical justifications for Visconti policies. Occasionally, *missive* to outside powers or to Visconti ambassadors contain strong language against Visconti enemies, but always in short phrases: "a liberatione servitutis jugi miserrimi Venetorum" (2:241), "rebelles imperii" (2:238), and "inimici imperii" (2:225). At least three tracts favorable to monarchy were composed elsewhere in northern Italy in the first decade of the fifteenth century, but none of them appears to be a direct answer to Florentine propaganda. Giovanni Conversini's *Dragmalogia* was written in 1404. For the date of the work, see B. Kohl, "Conversini (Conversano, Conversino, Giovanni [Giovanni da Ravenna])," *DBI* 28 (Rome, 1983), 577. The work is not a defense of tyranny as Baron contends (*Crisis*, 111) but of monarchy.

Uberto Decembrio's *De re publica*, published in 1420/21, was a pioneering effort to use the newly translated text of Plato's *Republic* to justify monarchy as the best practical form of government, with Visconti Milan in mind. The work remained a scholarly dialogue only indirectly related to contemporary events.[83] In form an appeal to Duke Filippo Maria to help revive the great tradition of liberal arts in Lombardy, it emphasized the importance of the liberal arts for good government. The Milanese chancellor drew on the role assigned to the guardians in Plato's work to argue that the proper functioning of the state depended on the cooperation of a select group of learned counselors and military men, all of whom had previously enjoyed the benefit of studying the seven liberal arts. By implication, Uberto

---

Two other defenses of monarchy were written in the decades on either side of 1400. The first, a short, self-contradictory essay entitled *De monarchia sive de optimo principatu*, by Pierpaolo Vergerio, is a series of badly coordinated personal reflections on the topic.

To judge from the number of surviving manuscripts, the most popular of the three treatises was Giovanni Tinti de Vicinis, *De institutione regiminis dignitatum*, ed. P. Smiraglia (Rome, 1977). Essentially a *speculum regis*, the *De institutione* brings together a large collection of ancient Latin ethical material organized under rubrics dealing with the moral life and comportment of the model prince. See Francesco Novati, "Un umanista fabrianese del secolo XIV: Giovanni Tinti," *Archivio storico per le Marche e per l'Umbria* 2 (1885): 103–57, who discusses Tinti's work and publishes documents relating to his life. Novati, in Salutati, *Epist.*, 3:658, n. 1 (from previous page), dates the *De institutione* to about 1405. The five manuscripts of Tinti's work are BAV, *Urb. lat.* 1192; Biblioteca comunale, Siena, G VII, 44 (fols. 25–57); BNP, *Lat.* 16623, fols. 2v–40v; Archivio biblioteca de la santa iglesia catedral, Burgo de Osma, Barcelona, 44, fols. 100–30; and ibid., 117, fols. 101v–37v (the last two are listed in Kristeller, *Iter italicum*, 4:497b). This compares with four manuscripts of Vergerio's work (listed in Vergerio, *Epist.*, 447), and with two of Conversini's (listed in *Dragmalogia de eligibili vita* in *Dragmalogia*, 39–41).

The works of Vergerio and Tinti give no indication that their authors had any awareness of current political affairs. Although in contrasting Venice as a republican government with his abstract model of monarchy Conversini never alludes to Florence, his introductory remarks show him to have been hostile to that city (*Dragmalogia*, 54): "Quid enim ignominiosius Cesaree maiestati, quam si mercenarius agnoscitur? Hunc, inquam, elatio Florentina stipendio pellexit in Latium .... Pudor Italice probitatis accire barbaros, quo preda barbaris pateat Italia." Cf. Baron, *Crisis* (1966), 493, n. 44.

[83] The work is found in BAM, B 123 sup., fols. 80–103. Hankins, *Plato*, 1:108, suggests that the earlier translation of the *Republic*, by Chrysoloras and Decembrio, which was published in the first half of 1402, had a political purpose. Plato's argument that oligarchies and democracies led to tyranny could be seen as directed against Florence, which the Milanese considered to be ruled by an oligarchy.

seemed to be arguing that a humanist education was necessary for those who wished to govern civil society successfully.[84]

While Uberto was within the medieval tradition in stressing the importance of divine guidance to the exercise of political power, he omitted the hoary analogy between princely rule and divine government and justified monarchy's superiority in practical terms on the grounds that it best served the needs of the political community. Monarchy favored no group or interest in the community over another. In all his actions, the committed ruler looked to the utility of the citizens, "forgetful of his own interests."[85] The claim that the monarch was above self-interest was not in itself novel, but the author's focus on the division of labor within the society came directly from Plato. Each member of the community, according to Decembrio, had a contribution to make according to his talents, and the work of each was vital to the good of the whole.[86] But deciding what those talents were and how they were to be put to use was not a matter for an individual's choice but rather for a princely commission (fol. 94v). An individual's family background, whether rich or poor, noble or common, counted for nothing.

---

[84] C. Vasoli, "La trattativa politica a Firenze e a Milano," in *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and C.H. Smyth, 2 vols. (Florence, 1989), 1:75. In Vasoli's words, Decembrio's presentation of the government of the philosopher king is "la proiezione del proposito umanistico di fare dell'educazione e ammaestramento del 'principe' la via principale per assicurare una nuova guida della società civile, secondo le aspirazioni e i criteri propri degli uomini di cultura." The best general discussion of Decembrio's work is by Hankins, *Plato*, 1:108–17.

Decembrio begins his discussion of guardians on fol. 90. He wants his guardians to be trained in the liberal arts and military discipline, but, because each one follows a career suited to his abilities, presumably some will be primarily scholars and others soldiers. Education of the guardians is described in fols. 97–97v. The prince will choose "virtuosos prudentes" as guardians (fol. 91v).

[85] Of the five forms of government, timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, tyranny, and aristocracy, Decembrio concludes that the last is the best but impractical. Of realistic constitutions, that of timocracy is superior (Hankins, *Plato*, 1:113, n. 4). Plato, Decembrio writes, advises "ut utilitatem civium sic tueatur ut quicquid aget ad eam referat sui commodi prorsus oblitus" (89v). Oddly, Decembrio cites as his example of the model ruler the founder of the Roman Republic and its first consul. However, he confuses Lucius Junius Brutus with Decimus Brutus.

[86] Decembrio breaks with Plato both on the absence of marriage among the guardians and on the military role of women. He reduces exceptional women to being wives of exceptional men, raising their children, and keeping house for them (fol. 91v).

Although the stress on the division of labor within the political community was Platonic, Uberto's remarks on civic morality sound less Platonic than Ciceronian. Uberto's citation of Plato's *Epistle* 9, 358a, a citation borrowed from Cicero's *De officiis*, I.7.22, reflected his lack of discrimination in dealing with his ancient sources:

> As Plato wisely says: We are not born for ourselves alone but partly for the motherland, partly for our associates and friends. Let each one of them strive to serve as many as possible and, following the benevolence of nature, focus on common utility and, in giving and receiving, conserve human society and friendship.[87]

The Ciceronian passage, however, reads:

> But since, as Plato has admirably written, we are not born for ourselves alone, but our motherland claims a part and our friends a part; and since, as the Stoics maintain, all things produced on earth are created for the sake of man, ... we ought to follow nature in this way as our leader, contributing to the common good by a mutual exchange of services, by giving and receiving, and so by skill, works, and talents unite the society of men, man to man.[88]

Overlooking Cicero's specific attribution of the second part of the thought to the Stoics, Uberto, apparently unwittingly, presented a statement embodying the Stoics' naturalistic ethic as if it were Plato's.

But Uberto used Cicero's *De officiis* as more than a source of a Platonic text otherwise unavailable to him. He also borrowed from it the key formulation of his own civic ethic when he wrote:

> ... every citizen should be careful to live with other citizens with a sense of right that is fair and equal, nor should he act humbly and abjectly so that he is held in contempt, nor should he exalt himself, lest he seem to oppress others. Moreover, he should desire what brings tranquillity and honor to his country. Finally, he should so act in such a way that he will be deemed a good and fair-minded citizen by all. Let him cultivate all

[87] "Ut sapienter Plato inquit non solum nobis orti sumus sed partim patrie partim sociis et amicis. Studeat unusquisque eorum servire quam plurimis natureque benignitatem sequendo communes utilitates in medium afferant dandoque et accipiendo humanem societatem amiciciamque conservent" (fol. 90v).

[88] "Sed quoniam, ut praeclare scriptum est a Platone, non nobis solum nati sumus ortusque nostri partem patria vindicat, partem amici, atque, ut placet Stoicis, quae in terris gignantur, ad usum hominum omnia creari ... in hoc naturam debemus ducem sequi, communes utilitates in medium afferre mutatione officiorum, dando accipiendo, tum artibus, tum opera, tum facultatibus devincire hominum inter homines societatem" (*De officiis*, I.7.22).

> the virtues, especially justice and moderation, by which two a man is most approved as good.[89]

De officiis, I.34.124, reads:

> In his private life a citizen ought to live on fair and equal terms with other citizens, conducting himself neither in a servile and humble manner nor domineering; and also, in public life, work for those things that give peace and are honorable. We are accustomed to esteem such a man and call him a good citizen.[90]

In stating his conception of civic morality thus, Uberto was reflecting more his encounter with contemporary republican political literature than with Plato's *Republic*. For almost fifteen years, framing their appeal in terms borrowed first from Cicero and subsequently from Aristotle, Florentine humanists had been calling on their fellow citizens to commit themselves to an active political life. Responding to the need to create a monarchical alternative to Florence's civic ethic, Uberto turned to Plato and, through the lens of Cicero, articulated a vision of a political community in which citizens played an active role while lacking political power.[91]

Although the treatise generally remained at the abstract level, Decembrio was also at pains to praise Milan: he extolled the city's inland site, between two rivers, as well as its climate and the exceptional religious devotion of its citizens (fols. 87–88v). He pointed to

---

[89] "Unicuique preterea civi cure esse debet equo et pari iure cum civibus reliquis vivere neque submissum et abiectum se gerere ut habeatur contemptui neque se efferentem ut alios videatur opprimere; tum in re publica illa velle que tranquilla et honesta sunt; postremo taliter se habere ut bonus vir et equus civis ab omnibus reputetur. Cultor sit virtutum omnium potissime iusticie et moderationis quibus duabus vir bonus maxime comprobatur" (fols. 93v–94).

The passage by Uberto is also cited by James Hankins, "The 'Baron Thesis' after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 329. Hankins uses the passage as evidence that such ideas were common and not merely the property of the Florentine republican humanists. I use the passage to argue that Uberto's position was not arrived at independently but reflected the influence of the *Laudatio* sixteen or seventeen years after its publication.

[90] "Privatum autem oportet aequo et pari cum civibus iure vivere neque summissum et abiectum neque se efferentem, tum in re publica ea velle, quae tranquilla et honesta sint: talem enim solemus et sentire bonum civem et dicere."

[91] Hankins, *Plato*, 1:113, writes succinctly: "The *Republic* is a source of authentic proof-texts which may be used to strengthen positions Uberto already holds *a priori* ...." Uberto frankly states that he prefers Aristotle to Plato because of Aristotle's clearer exposition and because his ethical and political thought are more practical (Hankins, *Plato*, 1:116).

Milan's central role in the ancient world as a capital first for pagan and then for Christian learning (fols. 80 and 89v), as well as to the city's fame as a "second Rome."[92] His condemnation of Facino Cane, a condottiere who had controlled Milan between 1410 and 1412, as a brutal tyrant struck a personal note – Facino had seized Decembrio's property and imprisoned him.

Not divorced from the world of practical politics or political discussion, Decembrio's *De re publica* cannot be considered a direct response to years of attacks by Florence in the name of liberty against tyranny either. The erudite, "private" character of the treatise, together with its apparently limited circulation – only one manuscript survives – suggests that Milanese humanists and their prince felt no compulsion to use ideological arguments to buttress the legitimacy of their polity. We cannot ignore the reaction of Bartolomeo Capra, Archbishop of Milan, who, learning of the attack on monarchy in Bruni's funeral oration for Nanni Strozzi, urged his humanist friends at the Visconti court in 1428–29 to advise the prince to commission Panormita to write a counterattack.[93] But neither Bruni's work nor Capra's intervention made a deep impression on the court. In any case, no one seems to have come forward to answer Bruni's supposed slanders.

Roughly fifteen years after his father's treatise, Pier Candido Decembrio finally made a direct response to Florence's propaganda, and specifically in the form of an attack on the *Laudatio Florentinae urbis*. The *Laudatio* had been reissued in 1434 in an effort to promote Florence rather than Basel as the site for an ecumenical council.[94] Pier Candido's *De laudibus Mediolanensium urbis in comparatione Florentie panegyricus*, published in 1436, may have been written in an effort to scuttle the Florentine plan.[95] With the exception of the last section, devoted to a detailed description of the victory of Milan over

[92] "Non fuit ergo mirum," he writes, "hanc urbem secunde Rome meruisse cognomen, pre ceterisque Italie urbibus floruisse, officium item per se et antiquas cerimonias observare coronamque Cesarum custodire" (fol. 88).

[93] Gary Ianziti, *Humanistic Historiography under the Sforzas: Politics and Propaganda in Fifteenth-Century Milan* (Oxford, 1988), 17, n. 42, corrects Baron, *Crisis*, 413–14, by identifying Capra's principal concern to be Bruni's oration. Only in passing did Capra mention Bruni's *Historiarum populi Florentini libri XII*, of which six books were completed at the time.

[94] Paolo Viti, *Leonardo Bruni e Firenze: Studi sulle lettere pubbliche e private* (Rome, 1992), 137–61.

Cremona, Decembrio constructed his work using Bruni's categories of analysis.[96] He aimed to demonstrate that, according to every major criterion of excellence that Bruni had produced, Milan outshone Florence.

The influence of Ciceronian oratorical prose is evident from the early pages.

> Admirabilis quedam res est eloquentia, princeps illustrissime, et quam paucorum ingenia huc usque assequi potuere. Quamobrem nonnullos et graves et doctos viros scimus, qui cum parem rebus de quibus verba facturi sunt eloquentiam prestare nequeant, studio tamen et voluntate ducti ea dicant, ex quis non tam laudem, meo iudicio, quam reprehensionem sunt consecuti. Moderanda igitur voluntas est, cohibendus appetitus, ipsisque voluntatibus frena iniicienda sunt, nec solum quid possis, sed quid debeas cogitandum.[97]

After a short sentence containing a reminiscence of the Pseudo-Quintilian, *Declamationes minores*, no. 268, "admirabilis res est eloquentia," the author constructs a Ciceronian period of four clauses, containing two paired sets of concordant words (*graves et bonos* and

---

[95] Ibid., 142.

[96] The work was initially published by Giuseppe Petraglione, with an introduction, in "*De laudibus Mediolanensium urbis panegyricus* di P.C. Decembrio," *Archivio storico lombardo* 34 (1907): 25–45. This edition, with a few corrections, is republished by Felice Fossati in *RIS*, n.s., 20.1 (Bologna, 1925–58), 1013–25. As Fossati writes (xvi): "Il *Panegyricus* però nel suo complesso è condotto sulla falsariga della *Laudatio* del Bruni; talora anzi Pier Candido, invece di opporre ragioni buone o cattive agli argomenti dell'aretino, si limita a parafrasare in favore di Milano quel che l'avversario ha detto per esaltare Firenze." The description of the Milanese victory referred to in the text is found in Fossati's edition, 1023–25.

The original composition of the *Panegyricus* has not survived, but the final lines of the dedication letter to Galeazzo Maria Sforza indicate that Decembrio was merely sending him a copy of the old oration: "Mitto preterea claritati tue, excellentissime princeps, copiam orationis alias per me edite in commendationem et gloriam inclyte urbis tue Mediolani ac principum tuorum memoriam et illustrissimi quondam genitoris tui laudem et tuam ..." (1014). If, as is likely, the oration had been initially dedicated in 1436 to Filippo Maria, these words suggest that it had also been reissued under the first Sforza.

[97] "A certain wondrous thing is eloquence, O most illustrious prince, and a thing that few talented minds up to now have been able to attain. Wherefore we are acquainted with several men, serious and wise, who, although they are unable to match with their eloquence the things about which they are to speak, motivated by desire and inclination, will say things from which, in my judgement, they derive not so much praise as criticism. Thus, will is to be controlled, appetite restrained, and reins are to be set to the wishes themselves, nor should we consider only what we can say but what we ought to say" (1014).

studio ... et voluntate) with a contrasting pair (*non tam laudem ... quam reprehensionem*) in the concluding clause.[98] The third sentence is tied together by four gerundives (*moderanda*, *cohibendus*, *iniicienda*, and *cogitandum*), but again concluded in the final clause by a contrasting *nec solum quid ... sed quid*. The use of the archaizing *quis* together with the abbreviated *potuere*, common in ancient prose, were probably designed to enhance the classical feel of the passage.

Nevertheless, despite Decembrio's mastery of oratorical style, the discursive character of the overall presentation, weighted with detail and repetition, failed to develop a high level of energy. The author seemed unable to attain a consistent tone, on the one hand acknowledging Bruni's talents and granting that Florence excelled in some respects, while on the other presenting the city as a perennial enemy of the Italian name and generally inferior to Milan.[99] A summary of the principal arguments tends to lend the presentation more coherence than it actually possesses.[100]

By its ideal placement between two rivers, Decembrio wrote, in the midst of a wide, fertile plain, with mountain views and temperate climate, Milan far surpassed Florence, shut within its hills. Decembrio then endeavored to emulate Bruni's perspectival vision of Flor-

[98] *Declamationes minores*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart, 1989), 83: "sit eloquentia res admirabilis."

[99] Bruni's style is praised (1015), and he is called "doctissimus" (1021). See also 1022. Decembrio seems to have had a genuinely high regard for Bruni. By contrast, in 1428, using a private letter to attack a speech recently given by Guarino in praise of Carmagnola, a condottiere who had betrayed the Visconti, Decembrio belittles the humanist by referring to him as "vir in dicendi facultate mediocris": Antonio Battistella, "Una lettera inedita di Pier Candido Decembrio," *Nuovo archivio veneto* 10 (1895): 120.

Decembrio's high regard for the city he attacks is evident throughout the work. As he writes (1019): "Etenim hec urbs [Milan] eiusmodi est, que non dicam splendore et ornatu, qua in re Florentina haud multas in Italia pares habet, sed magnitudine et opulentia non illam solum equet, verum ceteras orbis civitates longe antecellat." Bruni's boast about Florentine cleanliness in the *Laudatio* really seems to bother Decembrio, who agrees with the claim but dismisses its importance (1015): "Videre licet alias urbes, quibus, preter inanem quandam vicorum mundiciem ac decorem, nihil adsit. Quod cum minima huius urbis commoditate conferri queat."

[100] To illustrate: Beginning with Bruni's first arguments for Florentine superiority, the ideal site of the city and the beauty of its outward appearance, Decembrio details in an extensive passage the advantages of Milan (1015–16). After taking up the origin of Milan and the best form of government – passages taken almost word for word from his father's *De re politica* – he returns after a page to his earlier themes (1017–19). Inserted within this second treatment is a detailed disquisition on the relationship of astrology to geographical site (1018–19), again lifted from his father's work.

ence and its populated countryside by describing the beauties of the densely populated city and of the towns, villas, and castles that stretched out from its walls, covering the plains and the distant mountainsides. Founded by Celtic immigrants under Belloveso, nephew of the king of the Celts two hundred years before the Gauls attacked Rome, Milan, unlike other cities, had been founded by "a kingly stock and peoples," not by exiles or refugees.[101]

Passing without transition to the question of the best form of government, Decembrio, paraphrasing his father's words, chose timocracy as realistically the best form of the five possible constitutions. Again with his father, he cited as his example of the ideal ruler Lucius Brutus, a man *honoris victorieque avidus*, who sought praise for himself and utility for the *patria.* Both men identified Giangaleazzo Visconti as the contemporary model of the good ruler (1017). Unsurpassed in his skill in war, Giangaleazzo had been able to bring Florence, a city "considered the richest in a certain way and famous" in Italy, to its knees, so that it "could no longer protect itself or be safe except under his tutelage and authority."[102] Decembrio went on to discuss Milan's buoyant economy.

Returning to the question of Milan's origins, Decembrio admitted that the city was not founded by the Romans, but, apparently forgetting his claim for Milan's foundation by a kingly stock, he stressed that nobility acquired by one's own actions outshone inherited nobility.[103] Moreover, he maintained, just because the Roman people were noble did not mean that the fifty-three colonies founded by them inherited their virtue. At this point, he raised his strongest objection to Bruni's work yet, the claim that Florence had been founded by Sulla.

---

[101] "Ceteras etenim urbes aut extorres aut profugi patriis sedibus condidere; hec sola inventa est, que non agrestes aut obscuros celet autores, verum diis auspicibus clarissimam regum stirpem et populorum pre se ferat" (1017).

[102] "Nempe cum adversus Florentiam urbem bellum gereret, que inter ceteras Italie opulentissima quodammodo ac preclara habebatur ... adeo virtute, diligentia urbem sagacissimam elusit atque prostravit... nec se amplius tueri aut rem suam incolumem servare, nisi sub huius principis tutela et dignitate putaretur" (1017).

[103] He makes the same point later, when, in constrast to the inherited nobility of Florence, he writes, addressing the Milanese: "Attendite, viri Mediolanenses, et stirpem vestram recognoscite, cum videbitis quantum origine clari et conspicui omnium gentium maxime sitis, qui non exteris tantum nobilitate prestetis ...." (1021). He is obviously in contradiction, however, with his earlier claim that the founders of Milan were more noble than those of other cities.

> Was not the Fiesolan colony led out while Lucius Sulla was besieging the republican state with force and arms? Whence, therefore, did Florentines, who got their origin from the most plundering of tyrants, Sulla, get this peculiar hatred of tyrants?[104]

It is not surprising, he added, that in speaking of Florence's founding, Bruni neglected to mention the name of Sulla the tyrant. Had Bruni exercised his undoubted eloquence on behalf of a truly great and noble city, what could he not have achieved?[105]

Decembrio's final argument for the superiority of Milan led him to trace the role of the city from ancient times down to the present. That no prince chosen in Germany could become Caesar before being crowned at Milan testified to the distinguished role that the city played both in the late days of the empire and in subsequent centuries. Decembrio recalled the glorious resistance of this "second Rome" against Frederick I's effort to dominate Italy, and he claimed that through its efforts, "all Italy ... was liberated from slavery." But, while the city had fought "for the empire, for the dignity of the Italian name," Decembrio continued,

> not only are the Florentine people unacquainted with and immune to this glory, but rather, moved by hostile feelings or some thought, they have often tried to act otherwise.[106]

Most recently, the Florentines had been responsible for calling in the Germans under the new emperor and inviting the Count of Armagnac, with his formidable army, to invade Italy.

Having attacked Florence for betraying Italy, the author recounted in detail an example of Milan's military might, the naval victory of Filippo Maria's condottieri against the Venetians on the Po near

---

[104] "Numquid Lucio Sylla rem publicam vi et armis obsidente, fesulana colonia deducta est? Unde igitur Florentinis precipuum in tyrannos odium emicuit, qui a preditissimo tyrannorum Sylla ortum deduxere?" (1021).

[105] Feeling obliged to say something against Bruni's use of Tacitus to show the devastating effects of monarchy on creativity, Decembrio offers a chronologically questionable argument (1021–22): "Sed, heus tu, qui ea potissimum tempestate Florentiam coloniam deducatam perhibes, qua urbs Roma potentia, libertate, ingeniis clarissimis civibus maxime florebat, pene oblitus es: Ciceronem, Livium et in primis Maronem, divina ingenia Cesaris et Augusti temporibus, quorum res gestas haud contemnis floruisse. Quo igitur illa preclara ingenia, ut Cornelius inquit, abiere?"

[106] "Primum ut ostenderem hanc urbem pro imperio, pro dignitate italici nominis semper certavisse, et simul illud intelligeretur, Florentinorum gentem non modo hac gloria expertem esse et immunem, quinimo inimicica aut opinione aliqua commotam sepenumero secus attentasse" (1023).

Cremona in 1431, and then he abruptly broke off the discussion. The abrupt ending tempts the modern reader to suppose that the version of the work that has come down to us is incomplete, but in fact the text as we have it appears to be the one that Decembrio circulated among his friends and dedicated to his princely patrons.[107] The author apparently considered it to be a finished composition.

Despite Decembrio's awkwardness in presenting sequential arguments for Milan's preeminence among cities, his cluttered rebuttal of Bruni did provide a comprehensive political ideology for Visconti lordship. It seems obvious, though, that the ideological issues fascinating contemporary Florentine humanists had little real appeal to humanists of the Milanese court, and that Decembrio's rambling, uninspired defense of Milan was the best answer that the Visconti would make to the attacks of the reissued *Laudatio*.

Milan did produce a great orator in the early decades of the fifteenth century, but one who developed his talents elsewhere. Whereas the use of the oratorical genre had been more or less imposed on Pier Candido by Bruni's precedent, an Augustinian friar, Andrea Biglia (ca. 1395–1435), recognized the congeniality of oratory to the expression of political ideals and successfully exploited the genre to that purpose. Biglia, whose family had connections with the Visconti court, became a friar in 1412 and from then until his death lived mostly outside Lombardy.[108] He seems to have spent six years studying in Padua and then five in Florence (1418–23). He taught at Bologna for the next five years, until 1428, and after brief residences in Milan and then Perugia, settled in 1429 as a teacher in Siena, where he died in 1435.

Having delivered an oration before Pope Martin V in Florence in

[107] This is the comment of the editor (xxi). The work appears to have been well-received in Milanese circles, and Maffeo Vegio, who was at the time teaching in Milan, wrote that he was having his students copy the work: Mario Borsa, "Pier Candido Decembrio: L'umanesimo in Lombardia," *Archivio storico lombardo* 20 (1893): 49. The composition presumably did not have a wide distribution, because, as already mentioned, no copy of the edition has survived. See *Panegyricus*, xxii. As has been said, the edition is based on a copy of a reissued original.

[108] For his biography and a list of his works, see, [author anon.], "Biglia, Andrea (Andrea da Milano, Andrea de Billis)," *DBI* 10 (1968), 413–15. For bibliography, see Paul O. Kristeller, *Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning*, ed. E.P. Mahoney, 2nd ed. (Durham, N.C., 1992), 131. See also the list of Biglia's funeral orations published by John McManamon, *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1989), 256–57.

1419, Biglia, already recognized as a famous orator, was invited sometime between 1423 and 1428 to leave Bologna to come to Milan to give a funeral oration in commemoration of the death of Giangaleazzo Visconti.[109] Although as a student at Padua Biglia had probably studied theology, the sophisticated periodic construction of his oration on Giangaleazzo suggests that the young friar had taken advantage of Barzizza's teaching there.[110] Biglia may have learned in the Veneto that oratory could easily be wedded to politics, but it seems, on the basis of an incidental observation that he made, that he associated the connection with Tuscany.

Without entering into the rich detail of the *In exequiis Johannis Galeatii vicecomitis, ducis Mediolani laudatio funerea*, it can be said that the oration gave coherence and dramatic force to some of the themes circulating in Visconti propaganda during the years before Giangaleazzo's death. Comparing him to the great political innovators of ancient times, Biglia attributed to the duke the establishment of a unified government and legal structure over an area hitherto divided, seething with internal hostilities, and bereft of dignity and liberty.[111] In the tradition of his family, Biglia continued, the duke had protected Italy from the French and resurrected the country's military tradition (180). Also like his forebears, Giangaleazzo had been a builder, especially of churches and holy places. His support of the

[109] Early in the speech, Biglia notes that, if his speech is not well-received, he has already worked out a way to get back to Bologna: "Et ipse iam iter institui quo his habitis Bononiam profiscar" (L. Alberti, "Una orazione inedita dell'umanista Andrea Biglia," *Athenaeum* 3 [1915]: 173–85). Biglia gave another address on the occasion of another anniversary of the duke's death, but whether he gave it before or after the published one remains unknown (BAM, F 55 sup., fols. 50–57).

[110] To cite only the second sentence of the speech: "Cum presertim verendum sit ne si hoc loco atque hodie minus egero quam res unde dicendum est expostulet, gravem notam vestris iudiciis atque quae a me postea nullo pacto deleri queat excipiam" (Alberti, "Una orazione," 178).

[111] "Quippe quum antea Italia plura pene regna haberet quam op(p)ida neque libertati aut dignitati locus esset, hi primum in hanc provintiam (sic) cuiusdam auctoritatis nomen, aut ius intulere. Unde factum est ut dissipatis ac sublatis regulis, aut si verius dicendum est, latronibus universa res in unam dominationem concesserit" (179). Biglia seems to imply that the duke replaced the emperor as the authority in the area, and thus a strong authority was substituted for an ineffective one: "Quid dicam de hac ipsa nostra civitate, quae tot annos per nomen imperii occupata vix poterat agnoscere quam dominum haberet, libera ne an alterius arbitrio teneretur. Nullum paene inter hanc urbem ac reliquam provintiam foedus, omnia soluta, omnia delapsa, omnia dispersa, quod cuique iudicium erat pro lege habebatur" (179–80).

Church had included generous gifts to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher at Jerusalem (181–82). Just, equitable, and good, he had shown himself a superb administrator and had enjoyed the respect of other rulers, even barbarian and Moslem ones. The calamity and ruin that befell Italy on his death perhaps testified most clearly to the greatness of his accomplishment (183). But by way of consolation, Biglia reminded his listeners that Giangaleazzo was now "among the saints" (185) and that the current duke, Filippo Maria, well-trained for rule by his father, had already "either equaled or surpassed the glory of all his ancestors."[112]

Biglia's tendency to understand politics in terms of ideological conflict emerged in his *Rerum mediolanensium historiae*, covering the years 1402 to 1431.[113] In a central passage of that work, he described the Visconti seizure of Forlì in 1424, in violation of the treaty between Milan and Florence; the outbreak of hostilities; and the efforts of Florence to gain the Venetians as allies and of Milan to keep them neutral. To highlight the profound differences between the two enemy powers, Biglia used two opposing speeches given by ambassadors of both states before the Venetian senate. Such set speeches were common in humanist historiography, such as Mussato's histories. The speeches were designed to represent dramatically the motivations and attitudes of the speaker and the interests that he

[112] Ibid., 184. The second anniversary speech largely follows the earlier one, except that it includes an extensive praise of the ducal title and reiterates throughout the link between the ducal title and the achievements of Giangaleazzo. Biglia writes (fols. 50v–51): "Atque ut intelligatis quantum ipsi michi in hac oratione trepidandum sit primum nosse vos cupio solum hoc maximum atque eximium iudicio meo esse quod ducem nostrum et velut singulari quodam titulo ducem nominamus. Nomine si non fallar ita dixerim medio inter ipsam populi administrationem quam nostri rem publicam dixere ac regium fastum qui fere sunt ab grecis tiranni appellati, quos noster poeta imitatus latinum de Enea loquentem facit: 'Si ars mihi pacis erit dextram tetigisse tiranni.' Ne difficile ex rebus quoque sacris agnoscere quam salubre ac preclarum humanis rebus hoc genus imperii divino quoque iudicio fuerit quando ita homines eam gubernationem moderentur quemadmodum est initio rerum constituta." He then discusses the work of Moses and other leaders, both mythical and historical. His strongest proof of the importance of a duke as leader comes from biblical authority (fols. 51v–52): "Quibus rebus plane significatum arbitror nullum administrandarum rerum imperium summo illi totius orbis rectori esse gratius quam hunc ducum ordinem dum sese divine bonitatis iudicio dignos exhibeant, quando quidem ipse deus omnium rerum atque imperiorum dominator in suo, hoc est, in electo ab se populo primum duces esse voluit qui subiectam plebem fide ac ratione gubernarent."

[113] Andrea Biglia, *Rerum mediolanensium historiae*, *RIS* 19, cols. 10–158.

represented. Most recently, Bruni had used set speeches in *Historiarum populi florentini* as occasions for speakers to interpret specific issues in broad political and historical terms.[114]

Probably influenced by Bruni's funeral oration of 1428, Biglia, attributing the Florentine speech to Lorenzo Ridolfi, had the ambassador open with an attack on all kings and princes – "nay, I would say, tyrants" – who despised the names of liberty, republic, people, and senate.[115] The speaker proceeded to give ancient historical examples, identifying each generation of the Visconti family as oppressors of Italy. Only then did Ridolfi raise questions about Milan's reliability in keeping treaties and of the dire need for Venice to join its fellow republic against the Visconti menace.

When he turned to the Milanese orator, Giovanni d'Arezzo, Biglia characterized him as being "in the Tuscan manner of speaking not ineloquent."[116] This seems to identify Giovanni with the kind of political oration that his readers would recognize as peculiarly Florentine. As Biglia represented his speech, Giovanni began by pointing to Milan's good relations with Venice over many years and to the long period of peace along their border. He then turned to refuting the Florentine charge that kings have always been the enemies of republics by pointing out that the Roman Republic often maintained good relationships with kings and that without the kings' help, Roman arms would never have succeeded in conquering Asia or the East. Thus, Giovanni implied, the peaceful relationship between Milan and Venice was not unnatural. In the matter of Forlì, he stated, moreover, that the Visconti had sought to arbitrate the issues, but the Florentines had preferred war. They had likely been aggrieved because they could not take over Forlì as they had Pisa, Volterra, and Arezzo.[117]

The ease with which this Milanese humanist who had spent most of his adult life outside Milan could manipulate political rhetoric to ideological ends contrasted with the limitations of those who had

[114] Biglia would have known at least the first six books of the work. For further examples of contrasting sets of speeches in Biglia besides those that I am about to discuss, see Biglia, *Rerum mediolanensium historiae*, cols. 60–63 and 153–55.

[115] Ibid., cols. 78–79.

[116] Giovanni d'Arezzo is the speaker: "nec pro Tusca dicendi consuetudine infacundus" (col. 79). On Giovanni Corvini d'Arezzo, see Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, 1:36, 73–74, 78, 100–01, 119, 183, and 209.

[117] *Rerum mediolanensium historiae*, cols. 79–81, 60–63, and 153–55.

stayed at home. That Biglia identified such ideological discourse as Tuscan corroborates this chapter's characterization of the effects of oratorical humanism once it diffused beyond Tuscany. While oratory constituted the leading attraction of humanism for the Venetian patriciate as it did for the Florentine, Venetians only fitfully developed humanism's ideological dimensions. In Milan, by contrast, Ciceronianism arrived tardily, with Barzizza in the 1420s, and despite his enormous skills as a teacher, he proved unable to stimulate great enthusiasm for oratorical eloquence in his Lombard students, even in his politically sanitized version of the art.

In sum, considered only in terms of its effect on the debate about political constitutions, the importance of Ciceronianism in political thought appears minimal and largely limited to its contribution to the creation of a republican discourse in Quattrocento Florence. But if seen in the context of the ongoing tension between what I have characterized throughout this study as chivalric and Roman conceptions of political society, then its role was of the first importance. Ciceronianism served as the means by which traditional values of loyalty and service to one's commune, those values Albertano da Brescia, inspired by Seneca, had first articulated, were disseminated among the lords and patricians of a new age.[118]

Learning to imitate Ciceronian style through the medium of Cicero's writings, the student, whether residing in a republic or lordship, submitted to an indoctrination in civic values. Granted, in a signorial territory the republican aspects of Cicero's works were muted; nonetheless, the classical values of honor, patriotism, and service to the state that were enshrined in his prose were keys to good government, regardless of the regime. None of those values was foreign to the old communal ethic, but Ciceronianism gave them a new vitality. No longer merely disembodied ideas, learned aphoristically from traditional school texts, they were now part of patterns of thought absorbed through intense training in adolescence and anchored in the illusion that Ciceronian language was an incantation for reviving the ancient Roman spirit in contemporary youth. As the educational program of the humanists, with its oratorical component, expanded from Florence to become the norm for educating upper-

[118] Hankins, "The 'Baron Thesis,'" 327–30, describes these civic values in detail. He also stresses the importance of seeing civic humanism as common to lordships and republics.

class youth in the rest of Italy, the ideas of civic humanism became a common inheritance of the Italian political leadership everywhere. Yet the history of Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries demonstrates that although the ideals of civic humanism were taught, they enjoyed no easy victory over the forces of aristocratic privilege or particularism broadly identified with the chivalric model.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSION

This book insists that the origin of Italian humanism is a serious historical issue. Despite the vast body of scholarship on Italian Renaissance humanism, almost nothing has been written about its origin. The explanation is not difficult to find. As long as Petrarch, who first visited Italy as an adult in 1337, is considered the movement's progenitor, scholars will trace the origins of humanism in Italy to his contacts with individuals in a number of central and northern Italian cities beginning in the 1340s. The origins of Italian humanism, consequently, will appear unproblematic. Defined as "prehumanists," Lovato and Mussato may receive mention, but their careers will serve primarily as a preface to the main story that begins in Avignon. Once the impetus is traced to an Italian phenomenon beginning in the mid-thirteenth century, however, the question of origins becomes insistent.

The debt that Italy owed France for its contribution to the efflorescence of vernacular literature in the thirteenth century has generally been recognized, but France's role in the origins of Italian humanism must also be acknowledged. Whereas current scholarship admits a degree of French influence on Italian humanism in the years around 1300, I have argued that French literature and scholarship exerted their most important effect – and a decisive one – more than a century earlier, in the late twelfth century. A detailed analysis of that subject awaits another volume, but I have at least sketched the course of French cultural influence on Italy in the decades just before 1200. While ultimately declaring their independence of France by reaffirming their Roman origins, Italian vernacular writers continued to draw heavily on French vernacular models, while Latin writers exploited the philological achievements of France's twelfth-century Renaissance.

To appreciate the extent of French influence is to recognize the dearth of literary culture in twelfth-century Italy. I am largely sympathetic to the medievalist position that the Renaissance did not constitute a sharp break with the Middle Ages. I maintain, however, that modern medieval scholarship has for the most part tended to base its

assumptions about the study of ancient authors in twelfth-century Italy on southern Italian and transalpine evidence. My argument for a twelfth-century discontinuity in the study of ancient Latin literary texts in northern and central Italy lends credence to the humanists' own claim that they deserved credit for restoring the pagan authors to Italian schools.

In the late twelfth century, northern and central Italy realigned itself culturally with northern Europe, turning away from Germany and toward France. The birthplace of a new court culture, France held an attraction for the newly formed courtly societies of Italian principalities and the prosperous upper classes of Italian cities. While late in the twelfth century French vernacular literature penetrated Italy on a broad geographical front from Naples to the Alpine principalities in the west and from Venice and the Veneto in the east, Bologna was the primary point of entry for French Latin writings. From Bologna this scholarly influence subsequently spread to Padua, largely through the efforts of Paduans who studied at Bologna before returning to their native city. Two such Paduans, Arsegino and Rolandino, who studied with Boncompagno at Bologna at an interval of about twenty years, became intellectual leaders in Padua, preparing the way for the artistry and scholarship of Lovato.

The early poetry of Lovato represented an effort to establish Italian cultural independence after more than seventy years of nurture by France. Lovato's originality lay in his infusion of a new aesthetic impulse into what up to that time had been a piecemeal approach to Italy's own ancient legacy, a legacy then mainly known thanks to its transmission through a foreign intermediary. By insisting on imitating ancient poetic style, Lovato was in effect attempting to bring himself into contact with the mentality of Italy's ancient progenitors. Because in an undefined way he related it to his commitment as a citizen of Padua, his pursuit of ancient aesthetic ideals was more than a matter of taste for him. For the next 150 years, Italian humanists developed and sought to implement the aesthetic principles that they gleaned from Roman authors. Ultimately, the humanists were successful in convincing their lay contemporaries that knowledge of ancient Latin culture and facility with the ancient language provided the keys to individual and political greatness.

As I have insisted throughout this book, the revivification of Italy's ancient heritage and its rejection of French culture must, from its beginning, be seen in conjunction with a deeply felt need of Italian

intellectuals to find a model according to which they could interpret and justify Italy's peculiar political, urban, and lay character. Parallel to the effort of Lovato and his disciples to follow "in the footsteps of the ancients" was the concern of Latini and his successors to make the work of Latin pagan authors available to their fellow citizens in vernacular translation.

This study has offered an alternative account of the development of the early history of Italian humanism to that now current. To consider Petrarch a third-generation humanist is to appreciate his role in diverting humanism from the secular–civic orientation given it by the first two generations of humanists, an original orientation consistent with the secularism of lay culture in medieval Italy. Recognition of Petrarch's revolutionary part in an already existing movement enhances our sense of his originality, while allowing us to appreciate more fully the difficulties encountered by those, like Salutati, who tried to adapt Petrarchan Christian humanism to the needs of citizens in republican city-states. The secular character of the humanism of Salutati's disciples' requires less explanation. Italian humanism did not begin, as some scholars would have it, as a deeply Christian movement still closely linked to medieval Christian traditions, a movement subsequently secularized by Bruni and his followers. Rather, whether conscious or not of their antecedents, the fifth generation of humanists returned humanism to its original secular context, whence it had been wrenched by Petrarch.

Crucial to understanding the development of humanism in the century and a half between Lovato and Bruni is the recognition that from the beginning humanists did not intend to displace medieval literary Latin with classicizing Latin all at once. In criticizing this unarticulated assumption of modern scholarship, I have depicted the development of humanism as a conquest of successive Latin literary genres, beginning with poetry, and I have ascribed the pattern of advance in classicizing to the character of individual genres, the nature of their respective audiences, and the institutional constraints acting on the humanists' creative abilities. Perhaps the most important insight that I have gained by this approach is that genres belonging to the sphere of public rhetoric, that is, orations and public letters, remained in the domain of *ars dictaminis* throughout the fourteenth century. Classicizing was confined to poetry and other genres of private rhetoric, that is, the personal letter, historical writing, and the treatise.

My account has integrated the humanists' advance through the genres with a chronological study of stylistic change. As in so many other areas, Petrarch was the first of the humanists to articulate a theory of imitation. Anxious to define an individual's style as a projection of his personality, Petrarch espoused an eclectic conception of style that urged each writer to create his personal form of expression, based on what he considered the most congenial elements in the styles of ancient authors.

The advent of Ciceronianism after 1400 meant that for the first time the work of one ancient author was held up as the stylistic model for imitation for all Latin prose writers. The promotion of Ciceronian style was intimately linked with reviving interest in the Latin oration. Although I have been unable to provide a satisfactory explanation for the genesis of the new effort to reform the composition of speeches in the second half of the fourteenth century, it is clear that by the 1380s Cicero's speeches served as basic texts in several Florentine schoolrooms. Within a remarkably short time after the publication of Bruni's *Laudatio* in 1404, what I have called the first Ciceronianism – to distinguish it from the more rigid Ciceronianism of the late fifteenth century – was exercising a pervasive effect on humanist Latin style, even among those who claimed to be eclectic.

The precocious development of Ciceronianism in Florence is indicative of the leading role that Florence had come to play in the humanist movement by 1400. In part I have framed my narrative of the early history of humanism in order to suggest that the late-fourteenth-century ascendancy of Florentine humanism requires an explanation and cannot merely be taken as a given. Far more traditional in its Latin culture in 1300 than Padua or Bologna, Florence in 1400 surpassed any other Italian city in promoting the new scholarship and literary style. How is the change to be explained?

In Florence, the path of humanism had been cleared by a century of remarkable translations of ancient Latin works into Tuscan. By the 1380s, the Florentine patriciate had already become acquainted with the contents of many of the pagan texts and was receptive to appeals to the classics as sources of moral discipline and political wisdom. As a result, by the end of the fourteenth century, the Florentine patriciate was ready not only to patronize humanists and their endeavors but also to seek out formal training in ancient Latin literature and history for its sons. The emergence of Latin oration as a humanist enterprise represented the conjunction of humanists' ambi-

tions to invade the public sphere of discourse, on the one hand, with, on the other, patricians' ambition to provide for their sons the kind of education that would earn them respect.

Hans Baron's *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* has for decades frustrated scholars of Renaissance Florence, because they have acknowledged that Florentine discourse altered after 1404, but they have hesitated to credit Baron's explanation that the phenomenon was the result of an external threat to the city's liberty. Although the temporary disappearance of the Milanese threat must have enhanced Florentine confidence in republican institutions, my approach has been to explain the "crisis" largely as the result of the interplay of the first Ciceronianism with the need of the Florentine patriciate to find a way of interpreting in a favorable light the kind of political order that had emerged in Florence by 1400.

More than a hundred years of acquaintance with the Roman civic ethic by means of vernacular translations had helped shape the attitudes of the Florentine upper class toward their political role and their approach to governing. Although I am convinced that John Najemy is right to stress the connection between the civic discourse of early-fifteenth-century Florentine patricians and the deteriorating late-fourteenth-century guild politics, I find it insufficient to explain developments. In my analysis, Renaissance Florence marked an attempt to realize Albertano da Brescia's hope that the power of ancient Roman authors could save urban society from the violence and factionalism engendered by the chivalric ethic. While in much of the rest of Italy, especially in the nascent courts of Italian *signori*, chivalric values remained attractive, in Florence the role model for most patricians became not the knight but the citizen. In Bruni's *Laudatio* the values and aspirations of the Florentine patriciate coalesced into a consistent representation of Florentine culture and politics.

A product of his time, Bruni was not a radical republican: at only one point in his life did he deny the legitimacy of all constitutional forms save republican government. But the Latin of Cicero's texts offered him a conceptual field in which he could weave together a republican historical outlook with a laudatory analysis of Florentine republican institutions. I do not hold that Ciceronianism served automatically as a republican template for interpreting political experience. Barzizza's successful effacement of Cicero's republican preferences reveals that Cicero's language could be deployed in other political environments, such as the dukedom of Milan.

The first Ciceronianism, quite apart from its impact on the conception of Florentine republicanism, had far-reaching cognitive effects that were only tangentially related to its use for political purposes. To borrow a phrase from Petrarch, intensive daily intercourse with Ciceronian rhetoric made Cicero "take root in the innermost recesses" of the minds of Bruni's generation of humanists. Only the most recent phase in the dialogue of the Italian humanists with antiquity, Ciceronianism made its contribution to how western Europeans conceptualized their relationship to politics and time.

Since the eleventh century, Italian lawyers had established in principle both the feasibility and usefulness of studying ancient Roman law to help impose structure on the social and political institutions of contemporary society. Humanism not only validated the relevance of other areas of ancient writing to the same purpose but established a *personal* relationship with antiquity that was unknown to the lawyers. Specifically, sophisticated efforts at either heuristic or generic imitation of ancient authors entailed cultivating a complex, almost oxymoronic sense of accessibility and historical distance. The humanist writer, in contrast to the Roman lawyer, endeavored through imitation to establish reciprocity between his own text and the subtext or subtexts that he chose to imitate. In doing so, the humanist violated the formerly sacrosanct status of the ancient work and revealed its fragile contingency. Success in the ensuing dialogue with the past rested on the humanist's ability to establish the identity of his own voice, while at the same time borrowing weight and authority for that voice from ancient voices concurrently present in the subtexts. Only thus, by stressing the involvement of antiquity in his creation, could the humanist endow his style with the *vetustas* that he desired.

Used in this way, the great writings of antiquity gradually assumed the appearance of historical artifacts, products of a particular time and culture. The pagan literary corpus had been scattered and corrupted by time. As the effort to reconstitute it intensified, Italian humanists came to envisage antiquity not as an undifferentiated whole but as susceptible to periodization. This insight about ancient history forced humanists to locate their own society within the sweep of time. In contrast with Lovato, for whom the ancient past was essentially mythic, mid-fifteenth-century humanists enjoyed a broad perspective on human history down to their own time, conjoined

with a growing awareness of anachronism that would ultimately become part of the standard thinking apparatus of educated westerners.

A significant element in the growing sense of historical perspective was a fuller appreciation of the manifold possibilities for expressing temporal sequencing, especially through a more sophisticated use of the subjunctive mood. Intent on constructing an account of a historical event in a classicizing language, the humanist was encouraged to use his understanding of classical moods and tenses as an investigative tool for analysis. More than simply offering models of refined expression of temporal succession, including relationships of cause and effect, the ancient historians may have awakened humanists to the intricate layering of human events in time.

To judge by the Florentine case, the new sensitivity to historical change initially nourished a buoyant confidence in the power of human reason, informed by knowledge of the past, to construct the future. But such confidence prevailed only so long as Italian politics enjoyed relative independence from outside influence. In his remarkable *Machiavelli and Guicciardini*, Felix Gilbert has chronicled the growing pessimism of Italian elites after the French invasion of 1494, when the forces at work in politics seemed incomprehensible.[1] Nowhere is the futility of humanist faith in the power of reason to erect a virtuous earthly republic more evident than in the thwarted efforts of Machiavelli to rein in fortune.

In the final chapters of this book, I have suggested that the cognitive change occasioned by the humanists' return to the ancients was not limited to the temporal dimension but also affected western Europeans' awareness of spatial relationships. Beginning with Petrarch, I offered three examples of perspectival word-pictures, the last of which, Bruni's, preceded by more than two decades the first true representations of perspective in the visual arts. Continually orienting himself temporally by relating the succession of past events to his own point in time, the humanist cultivated a way of thinking that led to his conceiving of his immediate relationship to space in much the same way.

The causes behind the creation of visual perspective in the arts were of course various. The visual power that the humanists were to deploy had already been deftly wielded by the pilgrim Dante as he

[1] Felix Gilbert, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Florence* (Princeton, 1965), especially 105–52.

made his way through the vast imaginary spaces of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven. But those spaces did not belong to the secular world. When in the 1410s, Brunelleschi made his first perspectival drawings, he drew upon a growing understanding of what had initially been the transalpine science of *perspectiva*. Nonetheless, where the artist brought mathematics to bear, it was in aid of articulating a vision of spatial reality that had by then been laid out linguistically by the humanists. And along with the new way of describing space went a new way of describing time. It is fruitless to speculate about the relative importance of complexly interacting causes. Nevertheless, over the centuries, visual perspective and its temporal analogue, historical perspective, jointly defining the four dimensions of reality with the individual as focal point, were to become such widespread and ingrained features of European subjectivity that the historical contingency of such a world view would long be forgotten.

Even within the fifteenth century, the cognitive effects of the first Ciceronianism were far-reaching. While I am less insistent than Michael Baxandall on the determining effect of Cicero's style for contemporary humanist thought, nonetheless I have affirmed his position that the revived art of writing Ciceronian periods played a significant role in structuring humanist thinking. Indeed, as Baxandall argues, the aesthetic criteria for judging a successful Ciceronian period, according to rhetorical conceptions such as *compositio*, *varietas*, and *copia*, became so much a part of the humanist mentality that, without examination, humanists extended them to serve as criteria for judging visual art. While I only hesitatingly advanced the hypothesis that rhetorical criteria had any kind of formative effect on nonlinguistic spatial representation itself, the criteria certainly defined in large part the categories according to which the humanistically trained critic judged the art object.

Whereas the development of historical perspective may have intensified Petrarch's belief in the moral bankruptcy of his age and his yearnings for the transcendental, it seems to have enhanced the desire of Bruni and the main body of his humanist contemporaries to anchor their scholarly mission in the temporal realm. We have no idea what the religious beliefs of most members of the fifth generation of humanists were: they apparently felt no need to write them down, and the linguistic conventions of Ciceronianism, to which they were committed, encouraged their reticence. It did not matter that

the humanists never fully mastered the Ciceronian idiom, the linguistic game whose conventions filtered and articulated their experience.

Nonetheless, had the first Ciceronianism not come to terms with the Christian faith, its impact on western thought would never have been as profound as it was. If humanism intended to reform human values, it could not ignore a whole dimension of the experience of fifteenth-century Italians. Conveniently for the coherence of my account, I have ended my narrative before reaching the reflorescence of Christian humanism with Valla and his generation. My analysis of the first Ciceronianism, however, does identify a major obstacle confronting fifteenth-century humanists committed to reformulating Petrarch's Christian heritage for their own generation.[2]

While most humanists of Bruni's generation felt comfortable expressing themselves in pre-Christian linguistic forms, others, deeply religious, must have felt awkward imitating Ciceronian models in situations where articulation of Christian sentiments was appropriate. The funeral oration is a good instance. It comes as no surprise that Bruni's *Oratio in funere* for Nanni Strozzi, while promising the dead warrior everlasting fame, omitted even a minimal gesture in the direction of Christianity. The case of Leonardo Giustiniani, however, a devout Christian, as we know from other sources, illustrates how restrictive the linguistic bonds of Ciceronianism could be, even at this first stage.

Giustiniani's *Funebris oratio*, written in 1438 for the funeral of the Venetian war hero Giorgio Loredan, was analyzed in the last chapter for its style and the political ideas it expressed; here, its concluding paragraphs concern us. Having praised in succession Loredan's city, his family, and Loredan himself, Giustiniani, in the final passages, endeavoring to console the mourners, contrasted Giorgio's present

[2] Charles Trinkaus, "Humanistic Dissidence: Florence versus Milan, or Poggio versus Valla?" in *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations: Acts of Two Conferences at Villa I Tatti in 1976-1977*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and Craig H. Smyth, 2 vols. (Florence, 1988), 1:32–34, convincingly argues for two distinct filiations in the humanist tradition, which he represents as Poggio versus Valla. See also a similar twofold distinction in William Bouwsma, "The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought," in *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations: Dedicated to Paul Oskar Kristeller on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman and Thomas A. Brady, Jr. (Leiden, 1975), 3–60. In the last two chapters of the present book, dealing with the period after Salutati, I have discussed only the dominant wing of fifth-generation humanists, identified with Bruni and Poggio.

blissful status with the pain and suffering that he inevitably would have endured had his life continued:

> … he accepts the glory that no forgetfulness can ever dim. Posterity will speak of his deeds, purely, magnificently, and wisely executed, and will sing and venerate them .... If those who strive for the well-being and growth of the *patria* and who avoid no labors, terrors, or pains of the body to preserve them have a place among the blessed, where they have perpetual enjoyment, for whom is a more blessed seat reserved than for Giorgio?[3]

As a classicizing orator, Giustiniani was patently trying to describe Loredan's reward for bravery while retaining consistent expression throughout, but the result was to render the deceased man's ultimate fate indistinguishable from that promised to any ancient pagan hero.

One of the great uncharted efforts of devout humanists of Bruni's generation and the next – and here Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) probably played a central role – was to refurbish Petrarch's religious humanism with new language inspired by Cicero.[4] In an age of elegant taste, the alternative was to have the Christian message despised. Even Barzizza, a great master of Ciceronianism, seems to have been aware of a need for some linguistic accommodation.[5] Early fifteenth-century Christian scholars were confronting a similar problem to that faced by Latin Fathers of the early Church, who, endeavoring to gain status for Christianity, expressly fashioned an eloquent Latin for articulating the Christian message. One can only wonder at this point to what extent the reviving interest in the Church Fathers in the second quarter of the fifteenth century was linked to the attempt to create a refined, if necessarily eclectic, Latin,

---

[3] *Ad C.V. Georgium Lauredanum: Funebris oratio*, in *Orazioni, elogi e vite scritte da letterati veneti patrizi in lode di dogi, ed altri illustri soggetti*, ed. G.A. Morin, 2 vols. (Venice, 1795–96), 1:20: "... [Giorgio] accepit gloriam eam, quam nulla obscuratura sit oblivio. Semper enim res ipsius integre, magnifice, sapienter gestas loquetur ventura posteritas, decantabit, venerabitur .... Quod si ii qui patriae commodis et incremento incumbunt, et pro ea conservanda nullos labores, terrores, corporis cruciatus evitant, definitus est inter beatos locus, ubi aevo fruantur sempiterno, cui magis felicem quam Georgio sedem constitutam existimamus."

[4] For Traversari's biography, see Charles L. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany, N.Y., 1977).

[5] See the example given by Remigio Sabbadini, *La storia di Ciceronianismo e di altri questioni letterarie nell'età della Rinascenza* (Turin, 1885), 15.

capable of winning equal recognition with the diction of the secular Ciceronians.[6]

The efforts of northern Europeans in the second half of the fifteenth century to adapt humanist teachings to their own increasingly urbanized milieu was immeasurably helped by the presence of the newly invigorated religious current in contemporary Italian humanism. While the earliest initiators of the movement in northern Europe would mostly be clerics, giving scholarship a more pronounced religious orientation than in the south, northern pedagogues on the whole embraced the southern curriculum of Latin and Greek authors as the basis for training their elites. As in Italy, the same general curriculum would serve for grammar-school and university education down into the nineteenth century.

Within the twentieth century, and especially since the 1960s, the humanist curriculum, focused on the study of ancient Latin and Greek authors, has lost much of its appeal for western educators. I cherish no project to revive it. But in these concluding pages I feel compelled to respond to efforts to discredit the significance and contribution of humanistic education in its own time. I wish here to address the general charge that by focusing on the cultivation of the student's ability to write and speak Latin with fluency and even elegance, humanism de-emphasized, contrary to its claims, the student's moral and intellectual development.[7] First, on the basis of one of the major theses of this book, I assert that, although the humanists used rote exercises and other mnemonic techniques associated with the medieval classroom, they were, nevertheless, focusing them on the ancient authors only recently introduced into the curriculum, not

[6] On Christian eloquence in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see the studies on preaching by John W. O'Malley, *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine, and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c. 1450–1521* (Durham, N.C., 1979); John M. McManamon, *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1989); and Frederick J. McGinness, *Right Thinking and Sacred Oratory in Counter-Reformation Rome* (Princeton, 1995). On funeral oration, see especially McManamon, *Funeral Oratory*, 10–12, and his discussion of Poggio's oration on the death of Francesco Zabarella at the Council of Constance in 1417 as a model (11–14 and 65–68).

[7] This is one of the major criticisms of Renaissance humanist education made by Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 22–25. For a critique of their position, see Paul F. Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600* (Princeton, 1989), 407–10.

textbooks of late-ancient or medieval vintage. The new study of the ancient texts required students to develop a degree of linguistic expertise exceeding that expected two centuries earlier.

Second, to speak more directly to the criticism of the narrowness of the humanist educational program, I would call to mind the contrast made in the introductory chapter between today's approaches to studying the humanist movement and those taken by the humanists themselves when looking back over their own history. Nothing perhaps illustrates more clearly the intellectual gulf between our own time and that of the Renaissance than the nearly total failure of modern scholars to consider important what the humanists themselves considered the key to understanding their movement.

Recent battles over the literary canon in our schools and universities testify to our continuing conviction that reading shapes minds, especially young ones. But few combatants seem disturbed by the fact that many or most of the books on any proposed list of best books will be read in translation. To a degree, the lack of concern reflects realistic despair of inculcating the linguistic knowledge demanded otherwise. My sense is, though, that there is a prevalent although largely unspoken assumption that a narrative or a set of ideas can be wrenched unproblematically from one language and plunked into another.

Inherent in this approach is a tendency to reduce the aesthetic dimensions of writing and reading (and their power to persuade, a humanist would say) to cut-and-dried expressions of ideology. A failure to read primary texts in their own languages has become endemic in graduate literature programs and in much other current scholarship. What began as a justifiable recognition of the importance of political and sexual subtexts in literary works has become a preoccupation with those subtexts to the exclusion of aesthetic, philosophical, and moral concerns and a reductionist approach that regards rhetoric simply as a tool of domination. The humanists would not have understood this shriveled notion of their art.

While they may have shared our nonchalance about literature in translation when it came to the vernaculars, in the case of Latin (and here ancient Latin is understood) they were uncompromising. Encoded in the fiber of the language for them was a strenuous moral code and the clearsighted vision of reality that they claimed to impart in their instruction. Trained in ancient Latin as the fifteenth century knew it, the student supposedly left the schoolroom with the moral

foundation and intellectual training that he needed to serve his community and to think conceptually. To impose our own impoverished view of the power of language in judging this curriculum is to misunderstand the attraction it exercised for that age.

Did humanist education work? That is, did humanist schools produce disproportionate numbers of intelligent, upright beings? No one can answer the question. What we can affirm is that Western society in the fifteenth century and for many years thereafter believed humanist claims. If the appeal of humanism lay in part in its fashionableness, its value as a preparation for a variety of careers, and possibly even (although I am skeptical) even in its usefulness to despots who desired docile subjects, such motives do not explain either the movement's popularity or its longevity.

In our efforts to comprehend humanism's appeal, then, we surely ought to acknowledge, in light of the developments analyzed in the preceding chapters, the faith that early modern European intellectuals held in the indwelling power of the ancient Latin language – a power that, in their view, could potentially transform both society and self. That such a belief no longer holds sway in the academy ought not to distract us from recognizing its guiding influence upon the values and aspirations of the first humanists of the Renaissance.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX

Scholars have rightly regarded the refusal of Renaissance writers to follow the accentual patterns of the medieval *cursus* as a key factor in the genesis of classicizing prose. The purpose of this appendix is to examine the extent to which the writers studied in this monograph used the *cursus* and to what extent they ignored it in their desire to imitate the prose writers of antiquity. I have based my account of the *cursus* on the analysis found in Giovanni del Virgilio's *ars dictaminis*, one of the fullest discussions of *cursus* written in the fourteenth century.[1] Virgilio's analysis is representative of the treatment accorded *cursus* in other manuals of the century with two exceptions: in the names he assigns to the meters (which I will give in parenthesis after the customary designation) and in his identification of the *planus secundus* (*scaber* or *velox trisillabus*), a meter that I find first described, but not named, by Guido Faba in the early thirteenth century.[2] Based as it was on the trisyllabic form, analogous with the *planus* meter, I prefer the term *planus secundus* and refer to other forms of *planus* as *planus primus*. Both Mino da Colle and Pietro Boattieri considered it a form of *planus* and did not distinguish it as a separate *cursus*.[3] Weighing the accentual rather than the graphical aspect of the form, however, Gudrun Lindholm considers it as *tardus*.

The standard medieval *cursus* assumed that meter would be distributed over two graphical words. The standard papal *cursus* of the thirteenth century consisted of *velox* (*velox quatrisillabus*), *tardus* (*contrarius sive planus quatrisillabus*), and *planus [primus]* (*contrarius sive planus trisillabus*). The *velox* required the final word to be a quadrisyllable with primary accent on the penultimate, preceded by a word or final portion of a word containing at least three syllables with accent on the antepenultimate (e.g., *hóstibus tenebántur* or *impigérrime rapuérunt*). The *tardus* required a quadrisyllabic word accented on the antepenul-

---

[1] Printed by Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Un *ars dictaminis* di Giovanni del Virgilio," *IMU* 4 (1961): 194–97.

[2] "Guidonis Fabe *Summa dictaminis*," ed. A Gaudenzi, *Il Propugnatore*, n.s., 3, no. 1 (1890):347–48.

[3] Gudrun Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus: Seine Entwicklung und sein Abklingen in der Briefliteratur Italiens*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, no. 10 (Stockholm and Uppsala, 1963), 18, n. 31.

timate in final place, preceded by a word or final portion of a word containing at least two syllables with accent on the penultimate (e.g., *póssit retráhere* or *remíssa questóribus*). Finally, the *planus [primus]* consisted of a final trisyllabic word with penultimate accent, preceded by a word or final portion of a word containing at least two syllables with accent on the penultimate (e.g., *vibúrna cupréssus*). On the authority of Giovanni del Virgilio, I have chosen to consider the *planus secundus* as a separate meter, even if it would have been counted simply as *planus* or *tardus* by other *dictatores*. It consisted of two trisyllabic words with antepenultimate accents (e.g., *préstare aúditum*).

There is a fifth common metric pattern found in fourteenth- and early-fifteenth-century Italian texts but not mentioned as a form of *cursus* in Italian manuals. Called the *trispondiacus*, it may have been conceived initially with Cicero's *ésse videátur* as a model, pronounced with stress accents rather than quantitatively. The meter consisted of a final quadrisyllabic word with a penultimate accent, preceded by a word or final portion of a word containing at least two syllables, also accented on the penultimate. Because the *trispondiacus* was never explicitly defined and its graphical requirements were never written down, modern scholars have tended to regard as a *trispondiacus* any word-pattern of six syllables at the end of a sentence where the accent falls on the first, third, and fifth of the syllables. Such a pattern is common in everyday Latin speech, however, making it difficult to establish for a given literary passage where the meter appears whether the meter is there by accident or design. Probably for that reason, medieval *dictatores* did not count it among their arsenal of *cursus*. As Lindholm writes, the *trispondiacus* is not much used by those who adhere closely to the traditional *cursus*, but "bei denen mit freierem Rhythmus ist er dagegen häufiger."[4] Following her example, I provide statistics for this meter but do not consider its use as indicating loyalty to the *cursus*. For the purpose of identifying it, I consider any succession of words in the final position that follow the pattern ´ _ ` ´ _, ´ _ ´ ´ _, or ` _ ´ ´ _ to be *trispondiacus* (e.g., *dolórem ìnvenísse*, *míchi crédi vélim*, *adòlescéntes fóre)*. Because the Italian *dictatores*' rules did not allow words over four syllables in the final position of sentences, I have not counted six-syllable words as *trispondiacus* even where their stresses conform to the pattern.

[4] Ibid., 52.

In practice, *consillabicatio* was permitted for the first three *cursus*, but in such cases the pattern of the two graphical words that served as the model for each *cursus* had to be respected (*velox*, 3–4; *tardus* 2–4; and *first planus* 1, 2–3). Thus, the meter of the original quadrisyllabic final word of the *velox* meter could be distributed over two or three words (e.g., *dícere nímis débet*, *érigit àd supérna*, and *erígere nòs ad célum* for the *velox)*. In the case of the *tardus*, only one form of *consillabicatio* was permitted, that is, a monosyllabic word preceding a trisyllabic word in final place. The final trisyllabic pattern of the *planus primus*, moreover, could also be divided over two words (e.g., *férre vix póssent*). Although *piétas fúit* sustained the same metric pattern, it violated the original graphic representation of the meter. As for the *planus secundus*, *consillabicatio*, never allowed in the case of the final trisyllabic pattern, could occur in the preceding half of the meter (e.g., *aperíre non póterit*).

In the analyses of *cursus* below for different authors, I have not taken count of elisions. Monosyllabic words at the end of periods constitute a special problem. In general, they were forbidden, as are words of more than four syllables in the final position. There were exceptions, however. They were allowed in the final quadrisyllabic meter if accompanied by one or two other monosyllabic words that lengthened the line to quadrisyllabic length (e.g., *erígere nòs ad sé*) or when a question was involved and the monosyllabic word counted as a disyllabic word because of the suspension (e.g., *áliquem prèter té?*). The legitimacy of using monosyllabic forms of *esse* in the final position as part of the *cursus* was debatable, but in my analysis I have accepted them (*úr-bem re-cép-ti sunt*).[5] I have assumed that a *dictator* felt free to treat monosyllabic words as either long or short in composing his meters.

There is a rich bibliography on the *cursus*.[6] Because Lindholm deals with Italian writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, however, her book was particularly helpful to me. The main difference in our approaches to fourteenth-century *cursus* is that I have tried to follow the rules of *cursus* as they were given by fourteenth-century Italian manuals. That means that I have a separate category

[5] Ibid., 32–33.

[6] In addition to Lindholm, see especially Francesco di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei papi e nei documenti della cancelleria romana dal IV al XIV secolo* (Rome, 1937–46); Dag Norberg, *Introduction a l'étude de la versification latine médiévale* (Stockholm, 1958); and Tore Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century* (Stockholm, 1975).

for the *planus secundus* by whatever name it was known, whereas, as I mentioned above, Lindholm considers it a form of *tardus*. She also counts words of more than four syllables in the final position as legitimate parts of the *cursus* (e.g., *fàmiliáriter* or *nòbilitátem*) a practice that she acknowledges was accepted by French but not by Italian manuals.[7] Finally, whereas she does not, I have also insisted on accepting as the final meter of a *velox*, *tardus*, or *planus cursus* only words fitting into the graphical blocks initially defining those meters. Consequently, Lindholm accepts as *velox* an ending such as *creatióne octàvi cóeli*; as *tardus*, *fortitúdinis éxtitit*; and as *planus*, *scríbere quám nunc*, *hínc expectáte*, or *èlaboráte*.[8] Because such deviations occur relatively infrequently, our difference on this point does not significantly affect our statistics.

Our studies overlap for only two authors, Petrarch and Bruni. In the first case, my sample from Petrarch's *Rerum familiarium* only covers the first 200 period endings, whereas hers consists of 1,000. She was interested only in the correspondence and so did not sample his *De viris illustribus*. In the case of Bruni, her statistics are based on his correspondence and mine on his *Laudatio Florentinae urbis* and *Dialogi*. For comparative purposes, I have given her statistics for Petrarch and Bruni along with my own. For comparative purposes, I have also included her statistics for the letters of Salutati and Barzizza; it should be kept in mind that my way of reckoning the percentages would yield slightly lower figures.

My analysis of *cursus* is based on the following texts:

(1) Rolandino of Padua, *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie Trivixane*, ed. A. Bonardi, *RIS*, new ser., 8.1 (Città di Castello, 1905–08), 16–31 (200 endings);
(2) Albertino Mussato, *HA*, in *RIS* 10, cols. 27–357 (200 endings);
(3) Giovanni da Cermenate, *Historia Iohannis de Cermenate, notarii mediolanensis, de situ ambrosianae urbis et cultoribus ipsius et circumstantium locorum*, ed. L.A. Ferrai, in FSI, no. 2 (Rome, 1889), 3–27 (200 endings);
(4) Ferreto de' Ferreti, *Le opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti vicentino*, ed. Carlo Cipolla, FSI, nos. 42–44 (Rome, 1908–20), 42:9–41 (200 endings);

[7] Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus*, 25.
[8] Ibid., 122, 75, 128.

(5) Francesco Petrarch, *De viris illustribus*, ed. Guido Martellotti, vol. 1 (Florence, 1964), 3–39 (200 endings);
Idem, *Rerum familiarium* XII.1–9 (partial), in *Le familiari*. 3:3–32 (200 endings);
(6) Lapo da Castiglionchio, in Robert Davidsohn, "Tre orazioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio, ambasciatore fiorentino a papa Urbano V e alla curia in Avignone, *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 20 (1897): 234–46 (83 endings);
(7) Cino Rinuccini in Giuliano Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini e la scuola di Santa Maria in Campo," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 17 (1976): 661–62 and 663–65 (29 endings);
(8) Pierpaolo Vergerio, *Sermones* 5, 8, and 9 (almost to end) in *Sermones decem pro sancto Hieronymo* (Tempe, Ariz., 1999), pp. 170–195, 220–233; and 234–49 (200 endings);
(9) Leonardo Bruni, *Laudatio Florentinae urbis*, in Hans Baron, ed., *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni: Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature* (Chicago and London, 1968), 232–45 (200 endings); Bruni, *Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus*, in *Prosatori*, 44–70 (200 endings).

Table 1. Authors' use of standard *cursus*.

Author	*velox*	*tardus*	*planus 1*	*planus 2*	*trispond.*	other	TPSC[9]
Rolandinus	58.0	3.5	15.5	1.0	10.5	11.5	78
Mussato	13.5	23.0	20.5	2.0	16.0	25.0	59.0
Cermenate	20.5	5.5	12.5	3.0	27.5	31.0	41.5
Ferretto	26.0	24.5	23.0	4.5	6.5	15.5	78
Petrarch, *De viris*	23.0	17.0	10.0	2.0	19.5	28.5	52
Petrarch, *Rerum fam.*	38.5	17.5	9.5	4.0	8.0	22.5	69.5
Petrarch, *Rerum fam.* (Lindholm, p. 106)	36.9	27.4	9.7	under *tardus*	8.7	17.3	74
Lapo	13.25	24.0	13.25	2.4	19.3	27.7	52.9
Cino	48.2	3.5	20.9	3.5	6.9	17.0	76.1
Salutati (Lindholm, p. 138)	41.4	20.0	22.7	5.3	– –	10.6	84.2
Vergerio	17.0	7.0	19.0	6.5	21.0	29.5	49.5
Bruni, *Laudatio*	11.5	10.0	17.5	6.0	21.5	33.5	45.0
Bruni, *Dialogi*	5.0	21.0	16.0	4.0	23.0	31.0	46.0
Bruni, *Epist.* (Lindholm, p. 150)	14.9	12.6	30.5	– –	21.4	20.1	58
Barzizza, Epist. fam. (Lindholm, p. 159)	7.7	16.3	24.0	– –	26.4	25.6	48

[9] Total percentage of standard *cursus*.

My conclusions on the use of *cursus* in the authors studied in this book are as follows:

(1) The rules of *cursus*, initially formulated for letters in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, continued to exercise an influence on letter writing down to Bruni. Lindholm's study of a wide range of correspondence has proven this. As shown above, Petrarch used *cursus* in moderation (69.5 per cent; 73 per cent).

(2) While not as markedly, *cursus* also significantly influenced nonepistolary prose in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, as Rolandino's, Ferreto's, and Cino's use of *cursus* in 78 to 79 per cent of their period endings show.

(3) Lindholm's assertion that on average the chance of a Latin period ending with one of the accepted meters is about 50 per cent should be somewhat modified.[10] Cermenate's 41.5 per cent and Bruni's 45 or 46 per cent are probably closer to the average for chance occurrences of standard meters; 50 per cent probably represents the upper limit.

(4) The wide variation in the use of *cursus* in the fourteenth century in both epistolary and nonepistolary prose indicates that there was still no agreement on whether classicizing was incompatible with using accentual metric. The evidence provided by Lindholm for the fifteenth century shows that gradually, by Bruni's generation, the use of *cursus* came to be regarded as unacceptable in prose writing.

(5) Bruni's average of 59 per cent in his prose letters reflects, consequently, a degree of preference, if slight, for accepted meters as period endings, and not, as Lindholm believes, a complete break with the practice. To a lesser degree, the same is true for Mussato, Lapo, and Petrarch in prose other than letters.

(6) Generally speaking, however, a percentage of *cursus* below 60 per cent should probably be taken to mean that the writer was not consciously observing the standard *cursus*.

[10] Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus*, 151, n. 305.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Adalbertus of Samaria. *Praecepta dictaminum*, ed. F.J. Schmale. *MGH: Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3. Weimar, 1961.

Airaldi, Gabriella, ed. *Le carte di Santa Maria delle Vigne di Genoa (1103–1392)*. Genoa, 1969.

Alberto della Piagentina. In S. Battaglia, *Il Boezio e l'Arrighetto nelle versioni del Trecento*. Turin, 1929.

Alcuin of York. *Opusculum primum: Grammatica*. In *PL* 101.

Aldobrandino da Siena. *Le régime du corps de maître Aldobrandin da Siena: Texte français du XIIIe siècle*, ed. Louis Landouzy and Roger Pépin. Paris, 1911.

Alighieri, Dante. *Dante Alighieri: Rime della maturità e dell'esilio*, ed. M. Barbi and V. Pernicone. *Opere di Dante*, vol. 3. Florence, 1969.

——. *Il Convivio*, ed. Giovanni Busnelli and Giuseppe Vandelli. 2 vols. Florence, 1934.

——. *La corrispondenza poetica di Dante e Giovanni del Virgilio e l'ecloga di Giovanni al Mussato*, ed. Giuseppe Albini. New ed. edited by Giovanni Pighi. Bologna, 1965.

——. *Inferno: Translation with Commentary*, ed. Charles Singleton. 2 vols. Princeton, 1970.

——. *Opere minori*. 3 vols. Milan and Naples, 1995–96. Vol. 1.1, *Vita nuova* and *Rime*, ed. Domenico de Robertis and Gianfranco Contini. Vol. 1.2, *Il fiore*, ed. Gianfranco Contini. Vol. 2, *Il convivio*, ed. Cesare Vasoli and Domenico de Robertis. Vol. 3.1, *De vulgari eloquentia* and *Monarchia*, ed. Pier V. Mengaldo and Bruno Nardi. Vol. 3.2, *Epistole*, *Egloge*, and *Questio de aqua et terra*, ed. A. Frugoni, G. Brugnoli, E. Cecchini and F. Mazzoni.
See also Wicksteed and Gardner.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Opuscula omnia*, ed. J. Perrier. Paris, 1949.

——. *De regimine principum*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 16. Parma, 1864.
See also Ptolemy of Lucca, *On the Government of Rulers*.

Archivio di Stato di Genova. *Cartolari notarili genovesi (1–149)*. Vol. 1.1 of *Inventario*, ed. Marco Bologna. Pubblicazioni degli archivi di stato, 22. Rome, 1956.

Argelati, Filippo. *Bibliotheca scriptorum Mediolanensium*. 2 vols. Milan, 1745.

Aristides, Aelius. *Panathenaicus Oration and Defense of Oratory*. Vol. 1 of *Aristides in Four Volumes*, ed. and trans. C.A. Behr. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

Barbaro, Francesco. *Diatriba praeliminaris in duas partes divisa ad Francisci Barbari et aliorum epistolas*, ed. A.M. Querini. 2 vols. Brescia, 1741–43.

Barberino, Francesco. *I Documenti d'amore di Francesco da Barberino secondo i manoscritti originali*, ed. Francesco Egidi, 4 vols. Rome, 1903–27.

Bartolomeo da San Concordio. *Ammaestramenti degli antichi, latini e Toscani: raccolti e volgarizzati per fra Bartolomeo da San Concordio*, ed. V. Nannucci. Florence, 1841.

——. *Il Catilinario e il Giugurtinio di C. Crispo Sallustio, volgarizzati per frate Bartolomeo da S. Concordio*. Parma, 1860.

Bartolus de Sassoferrato. *De regimine civitatis*. In *Politica e diritto nel Trecento italiano: Il De tyranno di Bartolo da Sassoferrato (1314–1357)*, ed. Diego Quaglioni. Florence, 1983.

Barzizza, Gasparini. *Gasparini Barzizii bergomatis e Guiniforti filii opera*, ed. Giuseppe A. Furietti. 1 vol. in 2 pts. Rome, 1723.

——. "Barzizza's Treatise on Imitation," ed. G.W. Pigman III. *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 44 (1982): 341–52.

Bene of Florence. *Bene Florentini Candelabrum*, ed. Gian Carlo Alessio. Padua, 1983.

Benvenuto da Imola. *Commentum super Dantis Aldigherii Comoediam*, ed. G.F. Lacaita. 5 vols. Florence, 1887.

Benzo d'Alessandria. In Joseph R. Berrigan, "Benzo d'Alessandria and the Cities of Northern Italy." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 4 (1967): 125–92.

Bichilino da Spoleto. In Vincenzo Licitra, *Il Pomerium rethorice di Bichilino da Spello*. Quaderni del Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici nell'Università di Perugia no. 5. Florence, 1947.

Bigazzi, V. Lippi. *I volgarizzamenti trecenteschi dell'Ars amandi e dei Remedia amoris*. 2 vols. Florence, 1987.

Biglia, Andrea. *Andreae de Biliis: Mediolanensium rerum historiae*. *RIS* 19.

——. In L. Alberti, "Un'orazione inedita dell'umanista Andrea Biglia." *Athenaeum* 3 (Pavia, 1915): 173–85.

Billanovich, Guido. "'Veterum vestigia vatum' nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani: Lovato Lovati, Zambono di Andrea, Albertino Mussato e Lucrezio, Catullo, Orazio (*Carmina*), Tibullo, Properzio, Ovidio (*Ibis*), Marziale, Stazio (*Silvae*)." *IMU* 1 (1958): 155–243.

Biondo, Flavio. *Blondi Flavii forlivienis in Italiam illustratam*. Torino, 1527.

Bissolo, Bellino. In Vincenza Licitra, "Lo *Speculum vite* di Bellino Bissolo." *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 8 (1967): 1087–1146.

——. "Il *Liber legum moralium* e il *De regimine vite et sanitatis* di Bellino Bissolo," ed. Vincenzo Licitra. *Studi medievali*, 3rd. ser., 6, no. 2 (1965): 409–54.

Bisticci, Vespasiano. *Le vite*, ed. A. Greco. 2 vols. Florence, 1970–76.

Bolisano, Ettore. "Un importante saggio padovano di poesia preumanistica latina." *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia patavina di scienze, lettere ed arti* 66 (1953–1954): 60–75.

Bonifacio of Verona. *Eulistea*. In *De rebus a Perusinis gestis an. MCL–MCCXCIII: Historia metrica quae vocatur Eulistea*, ed. F. Bonaini, A. Fabretti, and F. Polidori. *Archivio storico italiano* 16 (1850): 3–52.

Boncompagno da Signa. *Liber de obsidione Ancone*, ed. Giulio C. Zimolo. *RIS*, new ed., 6.3. Bologna, 1937.

——. *Rhetorica antiqua (Boncompagnus)*, ed. L. Rockinger. In *Briefsteller und Formelbücher des eilften bis vierzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Quellen und Eröterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte, no. 9, vol. 1. Munich, 1863.

——. *Rhetorica novissima*, ed. A. Gaudenzi. In *Scripta anecdota antiquissimorum glossatorum*. Biblioteca iuridica medii aevi, ed. G. Palmerio, vol. 2. Bologna, 1888–1901.

Bovetini, Bovetino. In Violetta de Angelis, "Un carme di Bovetino Bovetini?" *IMU* 28 (1985): 57–69.

Bracciolini, Poggio. *Facezie*, ed. M. Ciccuto. Milan, 1983, 124–26.

——. *Lettere*, ed. H. Harth. 3 vols. Vol. 1, *Lettere a Niccolò Niccoli*. Vols. 2–3, *Epistolarum familiarium libri*. Florence, 1984–1987.

Bruni, Leonardo. *Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus*. In Garin, ed., *Prosatori* (q.v.).

——. "Bruni's *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*: First Printed Edition," ed. Hans Baron. In *From Petrarch to Bruni: Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature*. Chicago and London, 1968.

——. *De militia*. In C.C. Bayley, *War and Society in Renaissance Florence: The De militia of Leonardo Bruni*. Toronto, 1961.

——. *I Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*. ed. Giuseppe Kirner. Livorno, 1889.

——. *Dialogus de tribus vatibus Florentinis (Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio)*, ed. Carl Wotke. Vienna, 1889.

——. *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts*, trans. and ed. Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins, and David Thompson. Binghamton, N.Y., 1987.
——. In Claudio Grigio, "Due lettere inedite del Bruni al Salutati e a Francesco Barbaro." *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 26 (1986): 27–50.
——. *Leonardi aretini Historiarum florentini populi libri xii*, ed. E. Santini. *RIS*, new ser., 19.3. Città del Castello, 1929.
——. *Leonardo Bruni Aretino: Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften mit einer Chronologie seiner Werke und Briefe*, ed. Hans Baron. Wiesbaden, 1928.
——. *Leonardi Bruni Epistolarum libri VIII*, ed. L. Mehus. 2 vols. Florence, 1741.
——. *Leonardo Brunis Rede auf Nanni Strozzi: Einleitung, Edition, und Kommentar*, edited by Susanne Daub. Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1996.
Burdach, Konrad, with R. Kienast. *Aus Petrarcas ältestem deutschen Schülerkreise: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation: Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung, no. 4. Berlin, 1929.
Caffaro. *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCII*, ed. L. T. Belgrado and Cesare Imperiale di Sant'Angelo. 5 vols. FSI, nos. 11–14 bis. Rome, 1890–1929.
Calisse, C., ed. *Liber Maiolichinus de gestis Pisanorum illustribus, poema della guerra baleanica secondo il cod. pisano Roncioni*. FSI, no. 29. Rome, 1904.
Careri, Maria. *Il canzoniere provenzale H (Vat. Lat. 3207): Struttura, contenuto e fonti*. Modena, 1990.
Caresini, Rafaelo. *Raphayni de Caresinis, Cancellarii Venetiarum Chronica a 1343–1388*, ed. Ester Pastorello. *RIS*, new ser., 12.2. Bologna, 1922.
Carmen de gestis Frederici I imperatoris in Lombardia, ed. Irene Schmale-Ott. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum. Hannover, 1965.
"The *Carmen de gestis Frederici imperatoris in Lombardia*," ed. J.B. Hall. *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 26 (1985): 969–76.
See also Gesta.
Casini, T. "Notizie e documenti per la storia della poesia italiana nei secoli XIII e XIV: 1. Tre nuovi rimatori del Trecento (Appendice)." *Propugnatore*, n.s., 1, no. 5 (1888): 313–66.
Castellano da Bassano. *Poema Venetianae pacis inter Ecclesiam et Imperatorem*, ed. G. Monticolo and A. Segarizzi. *RIS*, new ser., 22.4. Città di Castello, 1906.
da Castiglionchio, Lapo. In Robert Davidsohn, "Tre orazioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio, ambasciatore fiorentino a papa Urbano V e alla curia in Avignone." *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 20 (1897): 225–46.
Cavalcanti, Giovanni. *Istorie fiorentine*. 2 vols. Florence, 1838–39.
Cermenate, Giovanni. *Historia Johannis de Cermenate, notarii mediolanensis de situ ambrosianae urbis et cultoribus ipsius et circumstantium locorum*, ed. L.A. Ferrai. FSI, no. 2. Rome, 1889.
Chiri, G. *La poesia epico-storica latina dell'Italia medioevale*. Modena, 1939.
Cola di Rienzo. *Briefwechsel des Cola Rienzo*, ed. Konrad Burdach and Paul Piur. Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation: Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung, no. 2.4. Berlin, 1912.
Contini, Gianfranco. *Poeti del Duecento*. 2 vols. Milan and Naples, 1960.
Convenevole da Prato. *Regia carmina dedicati a Roberto d'Angiò re di Sicilia e di Gerusalemme*, ed. and trans. Cesare Grassi, with essays by Marco Ciatti and Aldo Petri. 2 vols. Milan, 1982.
Conversini, Giovanni. *Dragmalogia de eligibili vite genere*, ed. and trans. H.L. Eaker. Lewisburg, Penn., 1980.
——. *Rationarium vitae: Introduzione, edizione, note*, ed. and trans. Vittore Nason. Florence, 1986.

Cortesi, Paolo. *De hominibus doctis dialogus: Testi, traduzione e commento*, ed. and trans. M.T. Graziosi. Rome, 1973.

Dandolo, Andrea. *Andreae Danduli ducis venetiarum Chronica*, ed. Ester Pastorello. *RIS*, new ser., 12.1. Bologna, 1938–58.

De laude civitatis Laudae, ed. C. Pertz. *MGH: Scriptores*, vol. 22. Hannover, 1872.

Decembrio, Pier Candido. In Antonio Battistella, "Una lettera inedita di Pier Candido Decembrio." *Nuovo archivio veneto* 10 (1895): 97–135.

——. *De laudibus Mediolanensium urbis panegyricus*, ed. G. Petraglione. *Opuscula historica*, ed. A. Butti, Felice Fossati, and G. Petraglione. *RIS*, new ser., 20.1. Bologna, 1925–58.

——. In Giuseppe Petraglione, "*De laudibus Mediolanensium urbis panegyricus* di P.C. Decembrio." *Archivio storico lombardo* 34 (1907): 25–45.

Dominici, Giovanni. *Johannis Dominici Lucula noctis*, ed. E. Hunt. Notre Dame, 1940.

——. *Regola del governo di cura familiare*, ed. Donato Salvi. Florence, 1860.

Erasmus. *Ciceronianus*, ed. Pierre Menard. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 1.2. Amsterdam, 1971.

Faba, Guido. *Arenge con uno studio sull'eloquenza d'arte civile e politica duecentesca*, ed. G. Vecchi. Bologna, 1954.

——. In A. Gaudenzi, "Guidonis Fabae Summa dictaminis." *Propugnatore*, n.s., 3, no. 1 (1890): 287–338; no. 2 (1890): 345–93.

——. In G. Vecchi, "Le arenge di Guido Faba e l'eloquenza d'arte civile e politica duecentesca." *Quadrivium* 4 (1960): 61–90.

——. *Parlementi e epistole*. In A. Gaudenzi, *I suoni, le forme e le parole dell'odierno dialetto della città di Bologna*. Bologna, 1889.

Fazio, Bartolomeo. *De viris illustribus liber*. Florence, 1745.

Ferreto de' Ferreti. *Le opere di Ferreto de' Ferreti vicentino*, ed. Carlo Cipolla. FSI, no. 42–44. Rome, 1908–20.

Filelfo, Francesco. *Francisci Filelfi Epistolarum Summa*. Venice, 1515.

"Frammento di un antico manuale di dicerie," ed. A. Medin. *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 23 (1894): 163–81.

Garin, Eugenio, ed. *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento*. Milan and Naples, 1952.

Gaudenzi, Augusto. *I suoni, le forme e le parole dell'odierno dialetto della città di Bologna*. Torino, 1889.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf. *Poetria nova*. In E. Gallo, *The Poetria Nova and Its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrine*. The Hague and Paris, 1971.

——. *Poetria nova*. In Edmond Farel, *Les arts poétiques du X11e et XIIIe siècles: Recherches et documents sur les techniques littéraires du moyen âge*. Paris, 1923.

Gesta di Federico I in Italia, ed. Ernesto Monaci. FSI, no. 1. Rome, 1887.
See also Carmen de gestis.

Ghirardacci, Cherubino. *Historia di vari successi d'Italia e particolarmente della città di Bologna*. 2 vols. Bologna, 1669.

Giovanni di Bonandrea. *Ars Dictaminis*. In James Banker, "Giovanni di Bonandrea's *Ars Dictaminis* Treatise and the Doctrine of Invention in the Italian Rhetorical Tradition of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries." Ph.D. Diss., Rochester, 1972.

Giovanni di Viterbo. *Liber de regimine civitatum*, ed. Gaetano Salvemini. In *Scripta anecdota glossatorum*, Bibiotheca iuridica medii aevi, ed. G. Palmerio et al. 3 vols. Bologna, 1888–1901.

Giuliani, Andrea. *Pro Manuele Chrysolora funere oratio*. In *Raccolta di opuscoli scientifici e filologici*, ed. Angelo Calogerà, vol. 25. Venice, 1741.

Giustiniani, Leonardo. *Funebris praestantissimi viri Leonardi Iustiniani: Pro Carolo Zeno Oratio*, ed. G. Zonta. *RIS*, new ser., 19, pt. 1. Bologna, 1941.

Gregory VII. *Das Register Gregorii VII*, ed. Erich Caspar. *MGH: Epistolae selectae*, 3rd ser., vol. 2. Berlin, 1929.

Gregory XI. *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Grégoire XI, 1370–1378, intéressant les pays autres que la France*, ed. Guillaume Mollat. Bibliothèque des École française d'Athènes et de Rome. 3 vols. Paris, 1962–65.

Guarino of Verona. *Epistolario di Guarino veronese*, ed. R. Sabbadini. 3 vols. Venice, 1915–19.

Guillaume de Poitiers. *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, ed. and trans. Raymonde Foreville. Paris, 1952.

Haller, Hermann. *Il Panfilo veneziano*. Florence, 1982.

Halm, K., ed. *Rhetores latini minores*. Leipzig, 1863.

Henry of Settimello. *Elegia*, ed. Giovanni Cremaschi. Bergamo, 1949.

I fatti di Cesare: Testo di lingua inedito del secolo XIV, ed. L. Banchi. Bologna 1863.

Jacques de Dinant. *Summa dictaminis*. In *A Textual Study of Jacques de Dinant's Summa dictaminis*, ed. Emil Polak. Geneva, 1975.

Jean de Montreuil. *Epistolario*, ed. E. Ornato. In *Opera*, vol. 1.1. Turin, 1963.

John of Salisbury. *Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive De nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum Libri VIII*, ed. C.C.I. Webb. 2 vols. Oxford, 1909.

——. *Metalogicon*, ed. J.B. Hill. Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio med., no. 98. Turnhold, 1991.

Kohl, Benjamin, and Ronald G. Witt, eds. *The Earthly Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society*. Philadelphia, 1978.

Lancia, Andrea. "Compilazione della *Eneide* di Virgilio fatta volgare per ser A.L. notaro fiorentino," ed. P. Fanfani. *L'Etruria* 1 (1851): 162–85, 221–52, 296–318, 497–508, 625–32, and 745–60.

Lanza, Antonio. *Polemiche e berte litterarie nella Firenze del primo Quattrocento: Storia e testi*. Rome, 1972.

Latini, Brunetto. *Li livres dou tresor*, ed. F.J. Carmody. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948.

——. *La rettorica*. In *La Rettorica italiana di Brunetto Latini*, ed. Francesco Maggini. Florence, 1912.

——. *Il Tesoretto (The Little Treasure)*, ed. and trans. Julia Bolton Holloway. New York and London, 1981.

——. *Le tre orazioni di M.T. Cicerone dette dinanzi a Cesare per M. Marcello, Q. Ligario e il re Deiotaro volgarizzate da B. Latini*, ed. M. Rezzi. Milan, 1832.

Laurence of Aquilea. "La *'Practica dictaminis'* de Llorens de Aquilea en un còdex de Tarragona," ed. S. Capdevila. *Analecta sacra Tarraconensis* 6 (1930): 207–29.

dei Libri, Matteo. *Arringhe*, ed. E. Vincenti. Documenti di filologia, no. 17. Milan and Naples, 1974.

Loschi, Antonio. In D. Girgensohn, "Antonio Loschi und Baldasarre Cossa vor dem Pisaner Konzil von 1409 (mit der *Oratio pro unione ecclesiae*)." *IMU* 30 (1987): 1–93.

——. In Giovanni da Schio, *Sulla vita e sugli scritti di Antonio Loschi vicentino, uomo di lettere e di stato: Commentarii*. Padua, 1858.

——. In V. Zaccaria, "Antonio Loschi e Coluccio Salutati (con quattro epistole inedite del Loschi)." *Atti dell'Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti: Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti*. 129 (1970–1971): 345–87.

——. In V. Zaccaria, "Le epistole e i carmi di Antonio Loschi durante il cancelleriato visconteo (con tredici inediti)." *Academia nazionale dei Lincei: Atti e Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 8th ser., 18 (Rome, 1975): 369–443.

——. *Inquisitio super XI orationes Ciceronis*. In *Q. Asconii Paediani patavini ad filios commentarii*. Paris, 1536.

Löseth, E., ed. *Le Roman en prose de Tristan, le Roman de Palamède et la compilation de Rusticien de Pise: Analyse critique d'après les manuscrits de Paris*. Paris, 1891. Rpt. Geneva, 1974.

dei Lovati, Lovato. In Guido Billanovich, "Lovato Lovati: L'epistola a Bellino: Gli echi di Catullo." *IMU* 32 (1989): 101–53.

——. In William P. Sisler, "An Edition and Translation of Lovato Lovati's *Metrical Epistles* with Parallel Passages from Ancient Authors." Ph.D. Diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1977.

——, et al. In C. Foligno, "Epistole inedite di Lovato de' Lovati e d'altri a lui." *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 37–58.

——, et al. *Lupati de Lupatis, Bovetini de Bovetinis, Albertini Mussati necnon Jamboni Andreae de Favafuschis carmina quaedam ex codice veneto nunc primum edita: Nozze Giusti-Giustiani*, ed. Luigi Padrin. Padua, 1887.

See also Bolisano; Megas.

Malispini, Ricordano. *Cronica*, ed. Alfredo Schiaffini. In *Testi fiorentini del Dugento e dei primi del Trecento*. 2 vols. Florence, 1954.

Manelmi, Evangelista. *Evangelistae Manelmi vicentini commentariolum de obsidione Brixiae anni 1438*. Brescia, 1728.

Manetti, Giannozzo. In Heinz W. Wittschier, *Giannozzo Manetti: Das Corpus der Orationes*. Cologne, 1969.

Marchetto da Padua. *Pomerium*, ed. Giuseppe Vecchi. Corpus scriptorum de musica, no. 6. Florence, 1961.

——. *The Lucidarium of Marchetto of Padua*, ed. and trans. J.W. Herlinger. Chicago, 1985.

Marsilio of Padua. *Defensor pacis*, ed. C.W. Previté-Orton. Cambridge, 1928.

——. *Defensor pacis nella tradizione in volgare fiorentino del 1363*, ed. Carlo Pincin. Turin, 1966.

——. *Marsiglio de Padoue: Oewres mineures: Defensor Minor; De translatione imperii*, ed. C. Jeudy and J. Quillet. Paris, 1979.

——. *Marsilius of Padua: The Defender of Peace*, ed. Alan Gewirth, vol. 2. Columbia, 1951.

——. *Writings on the Empire: Defensor minor and De translatione imperii*, ed. and trans. C. J. Nederman. Cambridge, 1993.

Martin of Troppau. *Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, ed. L. Weiland. *MGH: Scriptores*, vol. 22. Hannover, 1872.

Mattieu de Vendôme. *Ars versificatoria*. In Edmond Faral, *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècles: Recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du moyen âge*. Paris, 1924.

——. *Ars versificatoria*. In his *Opera*, ed. F. Munari. 3 vols. Rome, 1988.

Mazzini, Giovanni. *Miscellaneorum ex MSS libris bibliothecae Collegii Romani Societatis Jesu*, ed. Pietro Lazzero. 2 vols. Rome, 1754.

Megas, A. Ο προουμανιστικὸς κὺκλος τῆς Πάδουας (*Lovato Lovati – Alberto Mussato*) καὶ οἱ τραγῳδίες τοῦ *L.A. Seneca*. Salonica, 1967.

de Monacis, Lorenzo. In Mario Poppi, "Un'orazione del cronista Lorenzo de Monacis per il Millenario di Venezia (1421)." *Atti dell'Istituto veneto di scienze lettere ed arti: Cl. di scienze morali, lettere ed arti* 131 (1972–73): 464–97.

Mosè del Brolo. In Guglielmo Gorni, "Il *Liber Pergaminus* di Mosè del Brolo." *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 11 (1970): 409–60.

Müllner, K. *Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Paedogogik des Humanismus*. Vienna, 1899. Rpt. Munich, 1970.

Mussato, Albertano. *Sette libri inediti del De Gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII di Albertino Mussato*, ed. Luigi Padrin. Monumenti storici pub. dalla reale Deputazione veneta di storia patria, 3rd. ser. (Cronache e diarii), no. 3. Venice, 1903.

——. In Carmelo Calì, "I priapea e le loro imitazioni." In his *Studi letterari*. Turin, 1898.

——. *Historia augusta Henrici VII Caesaris et alia quae extant opera*. Laurentii Pignorii vir. clar. spicilegio necnon Foelici Osia et Nicolae Villani etc. Venice, 1636.

——. *Ecerinide: Tragedia*, ed. Luigi Padrin. Bologna, 1900.
——. In A. Moschetti, "Il *De lite inter naturam et fortunam* e il *Contra casus fortuitos* di Albertino Mussato." In *Miscellanea di studi critici in onore di V. Crescini*. Cividale, 1927.
——. In Gennaro Gennari, *Il libro X della storia di Albertino Mussato recato in versi italiani per le auspicatissime nozze Gaudio-Biasini*. Padua, 1863.
See also Bolisano; Dante Alighieri, *Corrispondenza poetica*; Megas; and Wicksteed and Gardner.
"The *Oculus pastoralis*," ed. Terence Tunberg. Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1987.
Oculus pastoralis. In Dora Franceschi, "*Oculus pastoralis* e la sua fortuna." *Atti dell'Accademia delle scienze di Torino: Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 99, pt. 1 (1964–65): 205–61.
"*L'Oculus pastoralis pascens officia et continens radium dulcibus pomis suis*." *Memorie dell'Accademia delle scienze di Torino: Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 4th ser., 11 (1966): 23–74.
Oculus pastoralis. Selections. In *Speeches from the Oculus pastoralis*, ed. Terence Tunberg. Toronto Medieval Latin Texts, no. 19. Toronto, 1990.
Orazioni, elogi e vite scritte da letterati veneti patrizi in lode di dogi, ed altri illustri soggetti, ed. G.A. Morin. 2 vols. Venice, 1795–96.
Orfino of Lodi. *De regimine et sapientia potestatis*, ed. Antonio Ceruti, Miscellanea di storia italiana, 7. Turin, 1869.
Osio, Luigi. *Documenti diplomatici tratti dagli archivi milanesi*. 3 vols. Milan, 1864–72.
Pace da Ferrara. *La festa delle Marie descritta in un poemetto elegiaco latino da Pace del Friuli*, ed. E. Cicogna. Venice, 1843.
——. In L.A. Ferrai, "Un frammento di poema storico inedito di Pace dal Friuli." *Archivio storico lombardo* 20 (1893), 322–43.
Pastregno, Guglielmo. *De viris illustribus et de originibus*, ed. G. Bottari. Studi sul Petrarca, no. 21. Padua, 1991.
Paul of Camaldoli. In Vito Sivo, "Le Introductiones dictandi di Paolo camaldolense (Testo inedito del sec. XII ex)." *Studi e ricerche dell'Istituto di latino*, 3 (1980): 69–100.
——. "The *Liber tam de Prisciano quam de Donato a fratre Paulo Camaldulense monacho compositus*: First Edition with Commentary," ed. Gilbert M. Boutroix. Ph.D. Diss., Ottawa, 1971.
Petrarch, Francesco. *Africa*, ed. Nicola Festa. Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca, no. 1. Florence, 1926.
——. *Breve pangerycum*. In E. Giannarelli, "Fra mondo classico e agiografia cristiana: Il *Breve pangerycum defuncte matris* di Petrarca." *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa*, 3rd ser., 9 (1979): 1099–1118.
——. *Bucolicum carmen*, ed. Thomas G. Bergin. New Haven and London, 1974.
——. *Collatio laureationis*. In C. Godi, "La *Collatio laureationis* del Petrarca nelle due redazioni." *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s. 5 (1988): 1–58.
——. *Il De otio religioso di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. G. Rotondi. Vatican City, 1958.
——. *Le familiari*. 4 vols. Vols. 1–3 ed. Vittorio Rossi; vol. 4 ed. Vittorio Rossi and Umberto Bosco. Edizione nazionale di Petrarca, nos. 10–13. Rome, 1933–42.
——. *Francesco Petrarca, Le Familiari: Introduzione, traduzione e note*, ed. Ugo Dotti. Rome, 1991.
——. In Benjamin Kohl, "Petrarch's Prefaces to the *De viris illustribus*." *History and Theory* 14 (1974): 138–144.
——. *Invective contra medicum: Testo latino e volgarizzamento di ser Domenico Silvestri*, ed. P.G. Ricci. Rome, 1950.
——. *Lettere disperse: Varie e miscellanee*, ed. A. Pancheri. Parma, 1994.

——. *Letters of Old Age (Rerum senilium libri I–XVIII)*, ed. A. Bernardo, S. Levin, and R.A. Bernardo. 2 vols. Baltimore, 1992.
——. *Liber sine nomine*. In Paul Piur, *"Buch ohne namen" und die päpstliche Kurie*. Halle an der Saale, 1925.
——. "On His Own Ignorance and that of Many Others," trans. Charles Trinkaus. *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, ed. E. Cassirer et al. Chicago, 1950.
——. *Opere latine*, ed. Giovanni Ponte. Milan, 1968.
——. *Opera omnia*. 2 vols. Basel, 1554.
——. *Petrarch: The Revolution of Cola di Rienzo*, ed. Emilio Cosenza. Chicago, 1913. Rpt. New York, 1986.
——. *Petrarch's Book Without a Name*, trans. N.P. Zacour. Toronto, 1973.
——. *Petrarch's Bucolicum carmen*, ed. and trans. Thomas Bergin. New Haven and London, 1974.
——. *Prose*, ed G. Martellotti, P.G. Ricci, E. Carrara, and E. Bianchi. Milan and Naples, 1955.
——. *Rerum familiarium*, trans. Aldo S. Bernardo. Vol. 1, *Rerum familiarium libri I–VIII*. Albany, N.Y., 1975. Vol. 2, *Rerum familiarium libri IX–XVI: Letters on Familiar Matters*. Baltimore and London, 1982. Vol. 3, *Rerum famliarium libri XVII–XXIV: Letters on Familiar Matters*. Baltimore and London, 1985.
——. *Rerum memorandarum libri*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich. *Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca*, vol. 5.1. Florence, 1943.
——. *Le senili: Libro primo*, ed. E. Nota. Rome, 1993.
——, et al. *Petrarcas Briefwechsel mit deutschen Zeitgenossen*, ed. Paul Piur. Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation: Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung, no. 7. Berlin, 1933.
Pitti, Buonaccorso. *Cronica di Buonaccorso Pitti con annotazioni, ristampata da Alberto Bacchi della Lega*. Bologna, 1905.
Platina, Bartolomeo. *Platinae De vita Victorini feltrensis commentariolus*, ed. E. Garin. In his *Il pensiero pedagogico dello umanesimo*. Florence, 1958.
Pseudo-Quintilian. *M. Fabii Quintiliani: Declamationes minores*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart, 1989.
Ptolemy of Lucca. *On the Government of Rulers: De regimine principum*, ed. by James Blythe. Philadelphia, 1997.
Quidort, John. *Johannes Quidort von Paris: Über königliche und päpstliche Gewalt (De regia potestate et papali): Textkritische Edition mit deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. and trans. Fritz Bleienstein. Stuttgart, 1969.
Quilichino da Spoleto. *Historia Alexandri nebst der Zwichauer Handschrift der Historia de preliis Alexandri magni*, ed. W. Kirsch. Skopje, 1971.
Rabanus Maurus. *De institutione clericorum*. *PL* 107.
Rainaldi, Odorico. *Annalium ecclesiasticorum Caesaris Baronii continuatione Odorici Raynaldi*, vol. 26. Lucca, 1738–40.
Raimbaut de Vaqueiras. *The Poems of the Troubadour Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, ed. and trans. J. Linskill. The Hague, 1964.
Riccobaldo of Ferrara. *Riccobaldi ferrariensis Compendium romanae historiae*, ed. Teresa A. Hankey. FSI, no. 108, in 2 pts. Rome, 1984.
Rinuccini, Cino. "Invettiva contro a cierti calunniatori di Dante e di messer Francesco Petrarcha e di messer Giovanni Boccaccio, i nomi de' quali per onestà si tacciono," ed. A. Lanza. In *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Quattrocento: Storia e testi*. Rome, 1972.
——. In G. Tanturli, "Cino Rinuccini e la scuola di Santa Maria in Campo." *Studi medievali* 17 (1976): 625–74.
——. *Risponsiva all'invettiva di messer Antonio Luscho*. In Coluccio Salutati, *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum vicentinum*, ed. D. Moreni. Florence, 1826.

Restoro d'Arezzo. *Composizione del mondo colle sue cascini*, ed. A. Morino. Florence, 1976.

de la Riva, Bonvesin. *De controversia mensium*, ed. G. Orlandi. In "Letteratura e politica nei *Carmina de mensibus (De controversia mensium)* di Bonvesin de la Riva." In *Felix olim Lombardia: Studi di storia padana dedicati dagli allievi a Giuseppe Martini*. Milan, 1978.

——. *Vita scholastica*. In *Quinque claves sapientiae*, ed. Anezka Vidmanova-Schmidtova. Leipzig, 1969.

Rolandino da Padova. *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie Trivixane*, ed. A. Bonardi. *RIS*, new ser., vol. 8.1. Città di Castello, 1905–1908.

Ronca, U. *Cultura medioevale e poesia latina d'Italia nei secoli XI e XII*. 2 vols. Rome, 1892.

Sabellico, Marcantonio. *De Latinae linguae reparatione dialogus*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 3. Basel, 1560.

Salutati, Coluccio. *De fato et fortuna*, ed. Concetta Bianca. Florence, 1985.

——. *De laboribus Herculis*, ed. B.L. Ullman. 2 vols. Zurich, 1951.

——. *De nobilitate legum et medicine: De verecundia*, ed. Eugenio Garin. Edizione nazionale dei classici del pensiero italiano, no. 8. Florence, 1947.

——. *De seculo et religione*, ed. B.L. Ullman. Florence, 1957.

——. *De tyranno: Coluccio Salutatis Traktat vom Tyrannen*, ed. A. von Martin. Berlin, 1913.

——. *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, ed. F. Novati. 4 vols. FSI, nos. 15–18. Rome, 1891–1911.

——. In Francesco Ercole, *Coluccio Salutati: Il trattato De tyranno e lettere scelte*. Bologna, 1942.

——. *Invectiva contra Antonium Loschum vicentinum*, ed. Eugenio Garin. In *Prosatori del Quattrocento*. Milan, 1950.

——. *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum Vicentinum*, ed. D. Moreni. Florence, 1826.

——. *Tractatus de tyranno von Coluccio Salutati*, ed. F. Ercole. Berlin, 1914.

da San Concordio, Bartolomeo. *Il Catilinario e il Giugurtinio di C. Crispo Sallustio, volgarizzati per frate Bartolomeo da San Concordio*, Parma, 1860.

Segarizzi, Arnaldo. *La Catania, le orazioni e le epistole di Sicco Polenton*. Biblioteca della letteratura italiana, no. 5. Bergamo, 1899.

Segre, Cesare, and Mario Marti, eds. *La prosa del Duecento*. Vol. 3 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi*. Milan and Naples, 1959.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Seneca's Tragedies*, ed. F.J. Miller. 2 vols. New York, 1917.

Thompson, D., and A.F. Nagel, ed. and trans. *The Three Crowns of Florence: Humanist Assessments of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio*. New York, 1972.

Tobler, A. *Die altvenezianische Übersetzung der Sprüche des Dionysios Cato*. Abhandlungen der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Berlin, 1883.

Torelli, Pietro. *L'Archivio capitolare della cattedrale di Mantova fino alla caduta dei Bonacolsi*. Verona, 1924.

Transmundus. *Introductiones dictandi by Transmundus*, ed. Ann Dalzell. Studies and Texts, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, no. 123. Toronto, 1995.

Trattato sopra l'uffizio del podestà: Scrittura inedita del buon secolo, ed. P. Ferrato. Padua, 1865.

Trattato sull'ufficio del podestà (da un codice del Sec. XV), ed. P. Misciattelli. Siena, 1925.

Traversari, Ambrogio. *Ambrosii Traversarii generalis camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum et ab alio de eodem Ambrosio latinae epistolae*, ed. L. Mehus. Florence, 1759. Rpt. Bologna, 1968.

Università di Firenze. *Statuti della Università e Studio fiorentino dell'anno MCCCLXXXVII*, ed. Alessandro Gherardi. Florence, 1881.

Urso da Genova. *De victoria quam Genuenses ex Friderico II retulerunt*, ed. T. Vallauri. In *Historiae patriae monumenta*, vol. 6 (Chartarum, vol. 2). Turin, 1853.
——. *Vittoria de' Genovesi supra l'armata di Federico II: Carme di Ursone notaio del secolo XIII*, ed. by Giovanni B. Graziano. Genoa, 1857.
Valerius, Marcus. *Bucolica*, ed. Franco Munati. 2nd ed. Florence, 1970.
Ventura da Foro di Longulo. In Pietro A. Uccelli, "Un foglio di Persio con commenti dal XIII secolo." *Archivio storico italiano*, 3rd ser., 22 (1875): 138–56.
Vergerio, Pierpaolo. *De republica veneta*, ed. Ronald G. Witt. In *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*, ed. Jill Kraye, vol. 2. Cambridge, 1997.
——. *Epistolario di Pier Paolo Vergerio*, ed. Leonardo Smith. FSI, no. 74. Rome, 1934.
——. In A. Gnesotto, "De ingenuis moribus et liberalibus studiis adulescentiae." *Atti e memorie della reale Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti in Padova*, n.s., 34 (1917–18): 75–157.
——. *Sermones decem pro Sancto Hieronymo*, ed. John McManamon. Tempe, Ariz., 1999.
de Vicinis, Giovanni Tinti. *De institutione regiminis dignitatum*, ed. P. Smiraglia. Rome, 1977.
Villani, Filippo. *Cronica*, ed. F.G. Dragomanni. 4 vols. Florence, 1844–45.
——. *De origine civitatis Florentie et de eiusdem famosis civibus*, ed. G. Tanturli. Padua, 1987.
——. *Nuova Cronica*, ed. G. Porta. 3 vols. Parma, 1990–91.
da Vimercate, Stefanardo. *De controversia hominis et fortunae*, ed. G. Cremaschi. Milan, 1950.
——. *Liber de gestis in civitate mediolanensi*, ed. G. Calligaris. *RIS*, new ser., 9.1. Città di Castello, 1912.
del Virgilio, Giovanni. In Paul O. Kristeller, "Un *Ars dictaminis* di Giovanni del Virgilio." *IMU* 4 (1961): 181–200.
See also Dante Alighieri, *Corrispondenza poetica*; Wicksteed and Gardner.
Walter of Châtillon. *Galteri de Castellione: Alexandreis*, ed. Marvin Colker. Thesaurus mundi no. 17. Padua, 1978.
——. *Moralish–Satirische Gedichten Walters v. Châtillon*, ed. Karl Strecker. Heidelberg, 1929.
Wicksteed, Philip H., and Edmund G. Gardner. *Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio*. Westminster, 1902.
Zambeccari, Pellegrino. *Epistolario di Pellegrino Zambeccari*, ed. L. Frati. FSI, no. 40. Rome, 1929.

Secondary Sources

Abbondanza, Roberto. "Gli atti degli Ufficiali dello Studio fiorentino, dal maggio al settembre 1388." *Archivio storico italiano* 117 (1959): 80–110.
Adami, Claudia. "Il beneficio veronese di Simone d'Arezzo." *IMU* 22 (1979): 208–22.
——. "Per la biografia di Giovanni Mansionario." *IMU* 25 (1982): 347–63.
——. "Per la biografia di Giovanni Mansionario: La questione di San Vito di Lusia." *Petrarca, Verona e l'Europa: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Verona, 19–23 sett. 1991)*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich and Giuseppe Frasso. Studi sul Petrarca, no. 26. Padua, 1997.
d'Addario, A. "Albizzi, Luca." *DBI* 2 (1960): 26.
——. "Albizzi, Rinaldo." *DBI* 2 (1960): 29–32.
Alessio, Franco. "Filosofia e scienza: Pietro da Abano." In *SCV* 2.

Alessio, Gian Carlo. "I Trattati di Giovanni del Virgilio." *IMU* 24 (1981): 159–212.
——. "L'allegoria nei trattati di grammatica e di retorica." *Dante e le forme dell'allegoresi*, ed. M. Picone. Ravenna, 1987.
Anonymus. "Biglia, Andrea (Andrea da Milano, Andrea de Billis)." *DBI* 10 (1968): 413-15.
Aquilecchia, G. *Enciclopedia dantesca*, 2nd rev. ed., s.v. "Malispini, Ricordano."
Arbesmann, R. "Der Augustineremitenorden und der Beginn der humanistischen Bewegung." *Augustiniana* 14 (1964): 250–314; *Augustiniana* 15 (1965): 259–93.
Arbusow, Leonid. *Colores rhetorici: Eine Auswahl rhetorischen Figuren und Gemeinplätze als Hilfsmittel für akademische Übungen an mittelalterlichen Texten*, ed. H. Peter. 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1948.
Arnaldi, Girolamo. *Studi sui cronisti della Marca trevigiana nell'età di Ezzelino da Romano*. Rome, 1963.
——. "Andrea Dandolo doge–cronista." *La storiografia veneziana fino al secolo XVI: Aspetti e problemi*, ed. A. Pertusi. Florence, 1970.
——. "Bonifazio veronese." *DBI* 12 (1970): 191–92.
——. "La Scuola nella Marca trevigiana e a Venezia nel secolo XIII." In *SCV* 1.
Arnaldi, Girolamo, and Lidia Cano. "I cronisti di Venezia e della Marca trevigiana dalle origini alla fine del secolo XIII." In *SCV* 1.
Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton, 1953.
Aurigemma, M. "I giudizi sul Petrarca e le idee letterarie di Coluccio Salutati." *Arcadia: Atti e memorie dell'Accademia letteraria italiana*, 3rd ser., 6 (1975–76): 67–145.
Avalle, D'arco S. *La letteratura medievale in lingua d'oc nella sua tradizione manoscritta*. Turin, 1961.
——. "Bonvesin de la Riva (Bonvicinus de Ripa)." *DBI* 12 (1970): 465–69.
Avesani, Rino. "Il preumanesimo veronese." In *SCV* 2.
Balbi, Giovanni Petti. *Insegnamento nella Liguria medievale: Scuole, maestri, libri*. Genova, 1979.
Baldelli, Ignazio. "La letteratura volgare in Toscana dalle origini ai primi decenni del secolo XIII." In *LI* 7.l.
Balsdon, J.P.V.D. "*Auctoritas, Dignitas, Otium*." *Classical Quarterly*, n.s., 10 (1960): 43–50.
Banti, Ottavio. "Ricerche sul notariato a Pisa tra il secolo XIII a il secolo X1V: Note in margine al Breve Collegii Notariorum (1305)." *Bollettino storico pisano* 33 (1964): 132–86.
Baranski, Zugmunt G. "The Ethics of Literature: The *Fiore* and Medieval Traditions of Rewriting." In *The Fiore in Context: Dante, France, Tuscany*, ed. Zugmunt G. Baranski and Patrick Boyde. Notre Dame and London, 1997.
Baron, Hans. Review of F. Engel-Janosi, *Soziale Probleme der Renaissance. Historische Zeitschrift* 132 (1925): 136–41.
——. *Leonardo Bruni Aretino: Humanistisch–philosophische Schriften mit einer Chronologie seiner Werke und Briefe*. Wiesbaden, 1928.
——. *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*. 1st ed., 2 vols., Princeton, 1955. 2nd rev. ed., 1 vol., Princeton, 1966.
——. *Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice*. Cambridge, Mass., 1955.
——. "Imitation, Rhetoric, and Quattrocento Thought in Bruni's *Laudatio*." In *From Petrarch to Bruni: Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature*. Chicago, 1968.
——. "The Year of Leonardo Bruni's Birth and Methods for Determining the Ages of Humanists Born in the Trecento." *Speculum* 52 (1977): 582–625.
——. *Petrarch's Secretum: Its Making and Its Meaning*. Cambridge, 1985.

——. *In Search of Florentine Civic Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought*. 2 vols. Princeton, 1988.

Barré, H. *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre: Authenticité, inventaire, tableaux comparatifs, initia*. Vatican City, 1962.

Bartoli, A., ed. *Catalogo dei MSS italiani della Biblioteca nazionale di Firenze*. 4 vols. Florence, 1879–85.

Baxandall, Michael. *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350–1450*. Oxford, 1971.

Bec, Christian. *Les marchands écrivains: Affaires et humanisme à Florence, 1375–1434*. Paris, 1967.

Becker, H.J. "Calderini, Giovanni (Caldarino, de' Calderari, Giovanni)." *DBI* 16 (1973): 606–08.

Benn, S.I., and G.F. Graus. *Public and Private in Social Life*. London, 1983.

Benson, Robert L. "Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, with Carol Lanham. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

Berrigan, Joseph B. "The Prehumanism of Benzo d'Alessandria." *Traditio* 25 (1969): 249–63.

——. "Early Neo-Latin Tragedy." In *Acta conventus neo-latini lovaniensis: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Louvain, 23–28 August 1971*, ed. Jozef Ijsewijn and Eckhard Kessler. Louvain, 1973.

Bertalot, Ludwig. *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, ed. Paul O. Kristeller. 2 vols. Storia e letteratura, nos. 129–130. Rome, 1975.

Bertoni, G. "Intorno a due volgarizzamenti di Boezio." In *Poeti e poesie del medio evo e del rinascimento*. Modena, 1922.

——. "Note e correzioni all'antico testo piemontese dei *Parlamenti ed Epistole*." *Romania* 39 (1910): 305–14.

Bezzola, Reto R. *La société féodale et la transformation de la littérature de cour: Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident (550–1200)*, pt. 2, t. 1. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences historiques et philologiques, no. 330. Paris, 1960.

Billanovich, Giuseppe. *Petrarca letterato*. Vol. 1, *Lo scrittoio del Petrarca*. Storia e letteratura, no. 16. Rome, 1947. Rpt. 1995.

——. "Gli umanisti e le cronache medioevali: Il Liber pontificalis, le Decadi di Tito Livio e il primo umanesimo a Roma." *IMU* 1 (1958): 103–37.

——. "Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro da Moglio, Francesco da Fiano." *IMU* 6 (1963): 203–34; *IMU* 7 (1964): 279–324.

——. "Tra Dante e Petrarca." *IMU* 8 (1965):1–44.

——. "Dalle prime alle ultime letture del Petrarca." In *Il Petrarca ad Arqua: Atti del convegno di studi nel VII centenario (1370–1374)*. Padua, 1975.

——. "Alle origini della scrittura umanistica: Padova 1261 e Firenze 1397." In *Miscellanea Augusto Campana*, ed. R. Avesani et al. 2 vols. Padua, 1981.

——. *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell'Umanesimo*. 2 vols. in 3. Studi sul Petrarca, nos. 9–11. Padua, 1981.

——. "Il Virgilio del Petrarca da Avignone a Milano." *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 2 (1985): 15–52.

——. *Petrarca e il primo umanesimo*. Studi sul Petrarca, no. 25. Padua, 1996.

——. "Ser Convenevole, maestro notaio e clerico." In *Petrarca, Verona, e l'Europa: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Verona, 19–23 sett. 1991)*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich and Giuseppe Frasso. Padua, 1997.

Billanovich, Giuseppe, and C.M. Monti. "Una nuova fonte per la storia della scuola di grammatica e retorica nell'Italia del Trecento." *IMU* 17 (1979): 367–412.

Billanovich, Giuseppe, and C. Scarpati. "Da Dante al Petrarca e dal Petrarca al Boccaccio." In *Il Boccaccio nelle culture e letterature nazionali*, ed. F. Mazzoni. Florence, 1978.

Billanovich, Guido. "Il preumanesimo padovano." In *SCV* 2.

——. "Abozzi e postille del Mussato nel Vaticano Lat.1769." *IMU* 28 (1985): 7–35.

——. "Il Cicerone di Rolando da Piazzola." *IMU* 28 (1985): 37–47.

Billanovich, Guido, and G. Travaglia. "Per l'edizione del 'De lite inter naturam et fortunam' e del 'Contra casus fortuitos' di Albertino Mussato." *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova* 31–43 (1942–54): 279–96.

Bischoff, Conrad. *Studien zu P.P. Vergerio dem Älteren.* Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte, no. 15. Berlin and Leipzig, 1909.

Black, Anthony. *Political Thought in Europe, 1250–1450.* Cambridge, England,1992.

Black, Robert. "The Curriculum of Italian Elementary and Grammar Schools, 1350–1500." In *The Shapes of Knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. D.R. Kelley and R.H. Popkin. International Archives of the History of Ideas, no. 124. Dortrecht, 1991.

——. *Studio e scuola in Arezzo durante il Medioevo e il Rinascimento: I documenti d'archivio fino al 1530.* Arezzo, 1996.

——. "Boccaccio, Reader of the Appendix vergiliana. The Miscellanea laurenziana and Fourteenth-Century Schoolbooks." In *Gli zibaldoni di Boccaccio: Memoria, scrittura, riscrittura, Atti del Seminario internazionale di Firenze-Certaldo (26–28 aprile 1996)*, ed. M. Picone and C.C. Bérard. Florence, 1998.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry.* 2nd ed. New York, 1997.

Blythe, James. *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages.* Princeton, 1992.

Boland, Andrea. "Art and Humanism in Early Renaissance Padua: Cennini, Vergerio, and Petrarch on Imitation." *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996): 469–87.

Bologna, Corrado. "La letteratura dell'Italia settentrionale nel Duecento." In *LI* 1.

——. "Tradizione testuale e fortuna dei classici italiani." In *LI* 7.1.

Bonaventura, Enzo. "Arrigo da Settimello e *l'Elegia de diversitate fortunae et philosophiae consolatione.*" *Studi medievali* 4 (1912–13): 110–192.

Boni, M. Review of P.G. Ricci's edition of Petrarch's *Invettiva contra quendam magni status hominem sed nullius scientie aut virtutis* (Florence, 1950). *Studi petrarcheschi* 3 (1950): 242–45.

Bonner, S.F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny.* Berkeley, 1977.

Borchardt, Frank L. "Petrarch: The German Connection." In *Francis Petrarch: Six Centuries Later*, ed. A. Scaglione. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1975.

——. "First Contacts with Italy: German Chancellery Humanism in Prague." In *The Renaissance and Reformation in Germany: An Introduction*, ed. G. Hoffmeister. New York, 1977.

Bordone, Renato. "L'influenza culturale e istituzionale nel regno d'Italia." In *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des Staufischen Kaisers*, ed. A. Haverkamp. Vorträge und Forschungen, no. 40. Sigmaringen, 1992.

Bornstein, Daniel. *The Bianchi of 1399: Popular Devotion in Late Medieval Italy.* Ithaca, N.Y., 1993.

Borsa, Mario. "Pier Candido Decembrio: L'umanesimo in Lombardia." *Archivio storico lombardo* 20 (1893): 5–75.

Bosco, Umberto, ed. *Enciclopedia dantesca.* 2nd. rev. ed. 5 vols. with append. Rome, 1984.

Bouwsma, William J. *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968.

——. "The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought." In *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of Its European Transformations*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman with Thomas A. Brady, Jr. Festschrift for Paul Oskar Kristeller on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Leiden, 1975.

Bowsky, William. *Henry VII in Italy: The Conflict of Empire and City-State, 1310–1313*. Lincoln, Neb., 1960.

Boyde, Patrick. *Dante, Philomythes and Philosopher: Man in the Cosmos*. Cambridge and London, 1981.

——. "The Results of the Poll: Presentation and Analysis." In *The Fiore in Context: Dante, France and Tuscany*, ed. Zygmunt G. Baranski and Patrick Boyle. Notre Dame and London, 1997.

Boyle, Marjorie O'Rourke. *Petrarch's Genius: Pentimento and Prophecy*. Berkeley and Oxford, 1991.

Bozzolo, Carla, and Ezio Ornato. *Préludes à la Renaissance: Aspects de la vie intellectuelle en France au XVe siècle*. Paris, 1992.

Branca, V. *Boccaccio: The Man and His Works*, trans. R. Monges. New York, 1976.

Brinkmann, Hennig. *Zu Wesen und Form mittelalterlicher Dichtung*. 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1979.

Brownlee, Kevin. "Jason's Voyage and the Poetics of Rewriting: The *Fiore* and the *Roman de la Rose*." In *The Fiore in Context: Dante, France, Tuscany*, ed. Zygmunt G. Baranski and Patrick Boyde. Notre Dame and London, 1997.

——. "The Practice of Cultural Authority: Italian Responses to French Cultural Dominance in *Il Tesoretto*, *Il Fiore*, and the *Commedia*." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 33 (1997): 258–69.

Brucker, Gene. "Florence and Its University, 1348–1434." In *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E.H. Harbison*, ed. T.K. Rabb and J.E. Seigel. Princeton, 1969.

——. *The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence*. Princeton, 1977.

——. "Humanism, Politics and the Social Order in Early Renaissance Florence." In *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations, Acts of Two Conferences at Villa I Tatti in 1976–1977*. 2 vols. Florence, 1979.

Brugnolo, Furio. *Il canzoniere di Nicolò de' Rossi*. Vol. 1, *Introduzione, testo e glossario*. Vol. 2, *Lingua, tecnica, cultura poetica*. Padua, 1974–77.

——. "I Toscani nel Veneto e le cerchie toscaneggianti." In *SCV* 2.

Brunner, Jerome. *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1996.

Buck, August. *Italienische Dichtungslehren vom Mittelalter bis zum Ausgang der Renaissance. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, no. 94 (1952).

Burger, Heinz Otto. *Renaissance, Humanismus, Reformation: Deutsche Literatur im Europäischen Kontext*. Berlin and Bad Homburg, 1969.

Bursill-Hall, G.L. "The Middle Ages." In *Historiography of Linguistics*. Current Trends in Linguistics, no. 13. The Hague and Paris, 1975.

Caggese, Romolo. *Dal concordato di Worms alla fine della prigionia di Avignone (1122–1377)*. Turin, 1939.

Calhoun, Craig J., ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought. Cambridge, Mass., 1992.

Camargo, Ronald. *Ars dictaminis, ars dictandi*. Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, fasc. 60. Turnhout, 1991.

Campana, Augusto. *Enciclopedia dantesca*, 2nd rev. ed., s.v. "Riccobaldo da Ferrara."

Camporeale, Salvatore. *Lorenzo Valla, Umanesimo e Teologia*. Florence, 1972.

Cantin, A. *Les sciences séculières et la foi: Les deux voies de la science au jugement de S. Pierre Damien (1007–1072)*. Spoleto, 1975.

Capello, Giuseppe. "Maestro Manfredo e Maestro Sion, grammatici vercellesi del Duecento." *Aevum* 17 (1943): 55–61.
Caplan, Harry. *Mediaeval Artes Praedicandi: A Supplementary Handlist.* Ithaca, N.Y., 1936.
——. *Mediaeval Ars praedicandi.* Ithaca, N.Y., 1954.
Caplan, H., and H.H. King. "Latin Tractates on Preaching: A Book-List." *Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949): 185–206.
Cardini, Franco. *Alle radici della cavalleria medievale.* Florence, 1981.
——. "Nobiltà e cavalleria nei centri urbani: Problemi e interpretazioni." In *Nobilità e ceti dirigenti in Toscana nei secoli XI–XIII: Strutture e concetti.* Florence, 1982.
Carile, A. "Caresini, Rafaino (Raffain, Raphainus, Raphaynus, Raphael de Caresinis)." *DBI* 20 (1977): 80–83.
Carlotto, Natascia L. "Pietro 'Nan' da Marano: ritratto di un cortigiano scaligero." In *Gli scaligeri, 1277–1387: Saggi e schede pubblicati in occasione della mostra storico-documentaria allestita dal Museo di Castelvecchio di Verona, giugno-novembre 1988*, ed. Gian Maria Varanini. Verona, 1988.
Carlyle, R.W., and A.J. Carlyle. *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West.* 6 vols. Edinburgh and London, 1903–36.
Carstens, R.W. *The Medieval Antecedents of Constitutionalism.* New York and London, 1992.
Casari, Cornelia. *Notizie intorno a Luigi Marsili.* Lovere, 1900.
Casella, M.T. *Tra Boccaccio e Petrarca: I volgarizzamenti di Tito Livio e di Valerio Massimo.* Padua, 1982.
Castagnetti, Andrea. "Appunti per una storia sociale e politica delle città della Marca veronese trevigiana (secoli XI–XIV)." In *Aristocrazia cittadina e ceti popolari nel tardo medioevo in Italia e in Germania*, ed. Reinhard Elze and Gina Fasoli. Bologna, 1984.
Catalano, Gaetano. "Contributo alla biografia di Uguccio da Pisa." *Diritto ecclesiastico* 65 (1954): 3–67.
Cecchini, Enzo. "La *Questio de prole*: Problemi di trasmissione e struttura." *IMU* 28 (1985): 97–105.
Cesari, Anna M. "Presentazione del codice laurenziano, *Plut.* xxix, 8." *Archivio storico lombardo* 100 (1973): 434–77.
Ceva, Bianca. *Brunetto Latini: L'uomo e l'opera.* Milan and Naples, 1965.
Chandler, T., and G. Fox. *3000 Years of Urban Growth.* New York, 1974.
Charland, T. M. *Artes praedicandi: Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au Moyen Âge.* Paris and Ottawa, 1936.
Châtillon, J. "Les écoles de Chartres et de Saint-Victor." *La scuola nell'occidente latino del alto medioevo.* Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, no. 19. Spoleto, 1972.
Checchini, Aldo. "Un giudice del secolo decimoterzo: Albertano da Brescia." *Atti del reale Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere, ed arti* 71 (1911–12): 1423–96.
Chistoni, Paride. *La seconda fase del pensiero dantesco: Periodo degli studi sui classici e filosofi antichi e sugli espositori medievale.* Livorno, 1903.
Chittolini, Giorgio. "Il 'privato,' il 'pubblico,' lo stato." In *Origini dello stato: Processi di formazione statale in Italia fra medioevo ed età moderna*, ed. Giorgio Chittolini, Anthony Molho, and Pierangelo Schiera. Bologna, 1994.
Cian, Vittorio. *Scritti minori.* 2 vols. (Turin, 1936).
Cipolla, Carlo. "Studi su Ferreto dei Ferreti." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 6 (1885): 53–112.
Cippola, Carlo M. *Clocks and Culture, 1300–1700.* London, 1967.
Cloetta, Wilhelm. *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Komödie und Tragödie im Mittelalter.* 2 vols. Halle, 1890–92.

Cognasso, Francesco. *Il piemonte nell'età sveva*. Turin, 1968.
Colish, M. "Eleventh-Century Grammar in the Thought of St. Anselm." In *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Âge*. Montreal and Paris, 1969.
Collodo, Silvana. "Un intellectuale del basso medioevo italiano: Il giudice–umanista Lovato di Rolando." *IMU* 28 (1985): 209–19.
Constable, Giles. "Petrarch and Monasticism." In *Francesco Petrarca, Citizen of the World: Proceedings of the World Petrarch Congress, Washington, D.C., April 6–13 1974*, ed. Aldo S. Bernardo. Padua and Albany, 1980.
Corti, Maria. Review of Gianfranco Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 2 vols. Milan and Naples, 1960. *Lettere italiane* 13 (1961): 503–14.
Cracco, G. "Relinquere laicis que laicorum sunt: Un intervento di Eugenio IV contro i preti–notai di Venezia." *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e dello Stato veneziano* 3 (1961): 179–89.
——. "Banchini, Giovanni di Domenico (Giovanni Dominici, Banchetti Giovanni)." *DBI* 5 (1963): 657–64.
Cranz, Edward P. "1100 A.D.: Crisis for Us?" In *De litteris: Occasional Papers in the Humanities*. New London, 1978.
Cremaschi, G. "Un codice e un commentatore bergamasco di Persio del secolo XIII (A.D. MCCLIII)." *Bergamum* 40 (1946): 21–29.
——. *Stefanardo da Vimercate: Contributo per la storia della cultura in Lombardia nel sec. XIII*. Milan, 1950.
Crescini, Vincenzo. "Note e appunti." *Giornale degli eruditi e dei curiosi* 5 (1885): 125–28.
Croll, Morris. *Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll*, ed. J. Max Patrick et al. Princeton, 1966.
Curtius, Ernst R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. W.R. Trask. New York, 1963.
D'Avray, D.L. *Death and the Prince: Memorial Preaching before 1350*. Oxford, 1994.
Dallari, U. *I rotuli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio bolognese dal 1384 al 1799*. 4 vols. Bologna, 1889–1924.
Davidsohn, Robert. *Die Geschichte von Florenz*. 4 vols. Berlin, 1896–1927.
Davis, Charles T. *Dante's Italy and Other Essays*. Philadelphia, 1984.
Dazzi, Manlio. "Il Mussato storico nel VI centenario della morte di Albertino Mussato." *Archivio veneto* 59 (1929): 356–471.
——. *Il Mussato preumanista, 1265–1329: L'ambiente e l'opera*. Venice, 1964.
Debenedetti, Salvatore. "Sui più antichi *doctores puerorum* a Firenze." *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 327–51.
Delcorno, Carlo. *Giordano da Pisa e l'antica predicazione volgare*. Florence, 1975.
Ditt, Ernst. "Piero Candido Decembrio: Contributo alla storia dell'Umanesimo italiano." *Memorie del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere* 24 (1937): 21–108.
Dotti, Ugo. "La formazione dell'umanesimo nel Petrarca: Le *Epistole metriche*." *Belfagor* 23 (1968): 532–63.
——. *Vita di Petrarca*. Rome and Bari, 1987.
Du Cange, C. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. 10 vols. Niort, 1883–87.
Duby, Georges. *Hommes et structures du moyen âge: Recueil d'articles*. Paris, 1973. English ed. *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. C. Postan. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1979.
——. *Histoire de la vie privée*, ed. Georges Duby and Philippe Ariès. 5 vols. Paris, 1985–87.
Edgerton, Samuel Y., Jr. *The Heritage of Giotto's Geometry: Art and Science on the Eve of the Scientific Revolution*. Ithaca, N.Y. and London, 1992.
Egidi, F. "Per la datazione della Divina Commedia." *La Rassegna* 37 (1929): 250–55.
Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process*, trans. Edmund Jephcott. 2 vols. New York, 1982.

Emerton, Ephraim. *Humanism and Tyranny: Studies in the Italian Trecento*. Cambridge, Mass., 1925.

Erdmann, Carl. *"Leonitas." Corona quernea: Festgabe für Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht.* Leipzig, 1941.

Eusebi, M. "La più antica traduzione francese delle *Lettere morali* di Seneca e i suoi derivati." *Romania* 91 (1970): 1–47.

Evergates, Theodore. "Nobles and Knights in Twelfth-Century France." In *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Thomas N. Bisson. Philadelphia, 1995.

Fasoli, Gina. "Nascita di un mito." In *Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino Volpe per il suo 80. compleanno*, vol. 2. Florence, 1958.

——. "La politica di Federico Barbarossa dopo Costanza." In *Popolo e stato in Italia nell'età di Federico Barbarossa: Alessandria e la lega lombarda.* Turin, 1970.

——. "Oligarchia e ceti popolari nelle città padane fra il XIII e il XIV secolo." In *Aristocrazia cittadina e ceti popolari nel tardo medioevo in Italia e in Germania,* ed. Reinhard Elze and Gina Fasoli. Bologna, 1984.

Favati, G. *Le biografie trobadoriche: Testi provenzali dei sec. XIII e XIV.* Bologna, 1961.

Feo, M. "Note petrarchesche." *Quaderni petrarcheschi* 7 (1990): 183–203.

——. "Politicità del Petrarca." *Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell'umanesimo: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Firenze, 19–22 maggio, 1991. Quaderni petrarcheschi* 9–10 (1992–93).

Ferrara, Roberto. "'Licentia exercendi' ed esame di notariato." In *Notariato medievale bolognese: Atti di un convegno (febbraio 1976)*, vol. 2. Rome, 1977.

Field, Arthur. "Leonardo Bruni, Florentine Traitor? Bruni, the Medici, and an Aretine Conspiracy of 1437." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 1109–50.

Filippi, Giovanni. "Politica e religiosità di Ferreto dei Ferreti." *Archivio veneto* 32 (1886): 309–27.

Filippini, F. "L'esodo degli studenti da Bologna nel 1321 e il Polifemo dantesco." *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna* 6 (1921): 107–57.

Fioravanti, Gianfranca. "*Sermones* in lode della filosofia e della logica a Bologna nella prima metà del XIV secolo." In *L'insegnamento della logica a Bologna nel XIV secolo*, ed. Dino Buzzetti, Maurizio Ferriani, and Andrea Tabarroni. Studi e Memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna, n.s., no. 8. Bologna, 1992.

Fisher, Craig B. "The Pisan Clergy and an Awakening of Historical Interest in a Medieval Commune." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 3 (1966): 141–219.

Fissore, G.C. "Cultura grafica e scuola in Asti nei secoli IX e X." *Bullettino dell'Istituto italiano per il medioevo e Archivio muratoriano* 85 (1974–75): 17–51.

Fiumi, Enrico. "Fioritura e decadenza dell'economia fiorentina." *Archivio storico italiano* 116 (1958): 443–510.

Flori, J. "Le origini dell'ideologia cavalleresca (a proposito di un libro recente)." *Archivio storico italiano* 143 (1985): 3–13.

Flutre, L.F. *Li Fait des Romains dans les littératures française et italienne du XIIIe au XVIe siècle*. Paris, 1933. Rpt. Geneva, 1974.

Folena, Gianfranco. "Parlamenti podestarili di Giovanni da Viterbo." *Lingua nostra* 20 (1959): 97–105.

——. "Cultura politica dei primi fiorentini." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 147 (1970): 1–42.

——. "Tradizione e cultura trobadorica nelle corti e nelle città venete." In *SCV* 1.

——. *Cultura e lingue nel Veneto medievale*. Padua, 1990.

Foresti, Arnaldo. "Le lettere a Lapo da Castiglionchio e il suo libro ciceroniano." In *Aneddoti della vita di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. A.T. Benvenuti. Studi sul Petrarca, no. 1. Padua, 1977.

Forte, Stephen L. "John Colonna O.P., Life and Writings (ca. 1298–1340)." *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 20 (1950): 394–402.
Franchini, V. *Saggio di ricerche su l'istituto del podestà nei comuni medievali.* Bologna, 1912.
Frasso, Giuseppe. "Erudizione classica e letterature romanze in terra trevigiana: Orazio Ambrosiano Q 75 sup." *IMU* 27 (1984): 30–55.
Fried, Johannes. *Die Entstehung des Juristenstandes im 12. Jahrhundert: Zur sozialen Stellung und politischen Bedeutung gelehrten Juristen in Bologna und Modena.* Forschungen zur neuren Privatrechtsgeschichte, no. 21. Cologne, 1974.
Fubini, Riccardo. "Biondo, Flavio." *DBI* 10 (1969): 534–59.
——. Review of Vittorio Zaccaria, "Le epistole e i carmi di Antonio Loschi." *Rivista storica italiana* 88 (1976): 865–71.
——. *Umanesimo e secolarizzazione da Petrarca a Valla.* Rome, 1990.
——. "From Social to Political Representation in Renaissance Florence." In *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, ed. A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, and Julia Emlin. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1991.
——. "All'uscita dalla Scolastica medievale: Salutati, Bruni, e i *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum.*" *Archivio storico italiano* 150 (1992): 1065–1103.
——. "Renaissance Historian: The Career of Hans Baron." *Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992): 541–74.
Gaisser, Julia H. *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers.* Oxford, 1993.
Galletti, Alfredo. "La 'ragione poetica' di Albertino Mussato ed i poeti–theologi." In *Scritti varii di erudizione e di critica in onore di Rudolfo Renier.* Turin, 1912.
——. *L'eloquenza (dalle origini al XVI secolo).* Milan, 1938. Rpt. 1958.
Gallo, F. Alberto. "Il trattatistica musicale." In *SCV* 2.
Gardner, E.G. *Arthurian Legends in Italian Literature.* London and New York, 1930.
Garfagnini, Gian Carlo. "Città e studio a Firenze nel XIV secolo: Una difficile convivenza." *Critica storica* 25 (1988): 182–201.
Gargan, Luciano. "Giovanni Conversini e la cultura letteraria a Treviso nella seconda metà del Trecento." *IMU* 8 (1965): 85–159.
——. *Studio teologico e la biblioteca dei domenicani a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento.* Padua, 1971.
——. "Il preumanesimo a Vicenza, Treviso e Venezia." In *SCV* 2.
Garin, Eugenio. "La cultura milanese nella prima metà del XV secolo." In *Storia di Milano*, vol. 6. Milan, 1955.
——. *L'educazione in Europa (1400–1600): Problemi e programmi.* Bari, 1957.
——. "Cultura filosofica toscana e veneta nel Quattrocento." In *L'umanesimo europeo e l'umanesimo veneziano*, ed. Vittorio Branca. Florence, 1963.
Gehl, Paul F. *A Moral Art: Grammar, Society, and Culture in Trecento Florence.* Ithaca, N.Y. and London, 1993.
Gianola, Giovanna Maria. "Tra Padova e Verona: il Cangrande di Mussato (e quello di Dante)." In *Gli scaligeri, 1277–1387: Saggi e schede pubblicati in occasione della mostra storico-documentaria allestita dal Museo di Castelvecchio di Verona, giugno-novembre 1988*, ed. Gian Maria Varanini. Verona, 1988.
——. "La raccolta di biografie come problema storiografico nel *De viris* di Giovanni Colonna." *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio muratoriano* 89 (1991): 509–40.
Gigante, M. "La cultura latina a Bisanzio nel sec. XIII." *La parola del passato* 17 (1962): 32–51.
Gilson, Etienne. "Beredsamkeit und Weisheit bei Cicero." In *Das Neue Cicerobild*, ed. K. Büchner. Darmstadt, 1971.
Girardi, Giacinto. *Rolando da Piazzola.* Padua, 1929.
Girgensohn, Dieter. "Antonio Loschi und Baldasarre Cossa vor dem Pisaner Konzil von 1409 (mit der *Oratio pro unione ecclesiae*)." *IMU* 30 (1987): 1–93.

——. "Gasparino Barzizza, cittadino padovano, onorato dalla Repubblica di Venezia (1417)." *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 19 (1986): 1–15.
——. "Francesco Zabarella da Padova: Dottrina e attività politica di un professore di diritto durante il Grande Scisma d'occidente." *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 26–27 (1993–94): 1–48.
Giusti, A. "Lingua e letteratura latina in Liguria." *Storia di Genova dalle origini al tempo nostro*, ed. A.R. Scarsella. 3 vols. Milan, 1941–42.
Gmelin, Hermann. "Das Prinzip der *Imitatio* in den romanischen Literaturen der Renaissance." *Romanische Forschungen* 46 (1932): 83–360.
Goldthwaite, Richard A. "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture." *American Historical Review* 77 (1972): 977–1012.
——. "Schools and Teachers of Commercial Arithmetic." *Journal of European Economic History* 1 (1972): 418–33.
Goodman, Dena. "Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime." *History and Theory* 31 (1992): 1–20.
Gorni, G. "Campesani (Campesanus, de Campexanis, de Campesanis, Campigena), Benvenuto." *DBI* 17 (1974): 493–96.
Gothein, Percy. *Francesco Barbaro (1390–1454): Frühhumanismus und Staatkunst in Venedig*. Berlin, 1932.
——. "Zaccaria Trevisan." *Archivio veneto* 21 (1937):1–59.
——. *Zacharias Trevisan: Leben und Umkreis*. Amsterdam and Antwerp, 1944.
Gouwens, Kenneth. "Ciceronianism and Collective Identity: Defining the Boundaries of the Roman Academy, 1525." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993): 173–95.
——. "Perceiving the Past: Renaissance Humanism after the 'Cognitive Turn.'" *American Historical Review* 103 (1998): 55–82.
Gray, Hannah H. "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963): 497–514.
Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven and London, 1982.
Grendler, Paul F. *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600*. Baltimore and London, 1989.
Griggio, Claudio. "Note sulla tradizione dell'invettiva dal Petrarca al Poliziano." *Buffere e molli aurette: Polemiche letterarie dallo Stilnovo alla 'Voce'*, ed. M.G. Pensa. Milan, 1996.
——. "Forme dell'invettiva in Petrarca." *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia patavina di scienze, lettere ed arti: Memorie della classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti* 109 (1996–97): 375–92.
Gruen, Erich S. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974.
Gualdo, Germano. "Antonio Loschi, segretario apostolico (1406–1436)." *Archivio storico italiano* 147 (1989): 749–69.
Guerri, D. *La corrente popolare nel Rinascimento: Berte, burle e baie nella Firenze del Brunellesco e del Burchiello*. Florence, 1931.
Guidotti, Paola. "Un amico del Petrarca e del Boccaccio: Zanobi da Strada, poeta laureato." *Archivio storico italiano*, 7th ser., 13 (1930): 249–93.
Guthmüller, Bodo. "Die volgarizzamenti." In *Die Literatur bis zur Renaissance*. Vol. 1 of *Die italienische Literatur im Zeitalter Dantes und am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Renaissance*, ed. August Buck. 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1989.
Gutiérrez, D. "La biblioteca di Santo Spirito in Firenze." *Analecta augustiniana* 5 (1962): 5–88.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1962.
Haller, Joseph. "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Marsilius von Padua." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 48 (1929): 166–97.
Hankey, A. Teresa. "Domenico di Bandini of Arezzo (1335–1418?)." *Italian Studies* 12 (1957): 110–28.
——. *Riccobaldo of Ferrara: His Life, Works and Influence*. Rome, 1996.
Hankins, James. *Plato in the Renaissance*. 2 vols. Leiden and New York, 1991.
——. "Cosimo de' Medici as a Patron of Humanistic Literature." In *Cosimo 'Il Vecchio' de' Medici 1389–1494: Essays in Commemoration of the 600th Anniversary of Cosimo de' Medici's Birthday*, ed. F. Ames-Lewis. Oxford, 1992.
——. "The 'Baron Thesis' after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 309–38.
——. "Rhetoric, History, and Ideology: The Civic Panegyrics of Leonardo Bruni." In *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections*, ed. James Hankins. Cambridge and New York (forthcoming).
Hardison, O.B. "The Orator and Poet: The Dilemma of Humanist Literature." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1971): 33–44.
Haverkamp, Alfred. "Der Konstanzer Friede zwischen Kaiser und Lombardenbund (1183)." In *Kommunale Bündnisse Oberitaliens und Oberdeutschlands im Vergleich*, ed. Hermut Maurer. Vorträge und Forschungen, no. 33. 1987.
——. *Herrschaftsformen der Frühstaufer in Reichsitalien*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1970.
Hay, Dennis. *The Italian Renaissance in its Historical Background*. 2nd ed. Cambridge and New York, 1961.
Hazard, Paul. "Étude sur la latinité de Pétrarque d'après le livre 24 des *Epistolae familiares*." *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 24 (1904): 219–46.
Herde, Peter. "Politik und Rhetorik in Florenz am Vorabend der Renaissance: Die ideologische Rechtsfertigung der Florentiner Aussenpolitik durch Coluccio Salutati." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965): 141–220.
Herlihy, David. *Pisa in the Early Renaissance: A Study of Urban Growth*. New Haven, 1958.
——. "Tuscan Names, 1200–1500." *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988): 561– 82.
Herlihy, David, and Christiane Klapisch-Zuber. *Les Toscans et leurs familles: Une étude du Catasto florentin de 1427*. Paris, 1978.
Hertter, Fritz. *Die Podestàliteratur Italiens im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig, 1910. Rpt. Hildesheim, 1973.
Hofmann, J.B., and Anton Szantyr. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich, 1965.
Holmes, George. *Florence, Rome, and the Origins of the Renaissance*. Oxford, 1986.
——. *The Florentine Enlightenment, 1400–1450*. London, 1969.
Hunt, R.W. *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, ed. G.L. Bursill-Hall. Amsterdam, 1980.
Hyde, John Kenneth. "Medieval Descriptions of Cities." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48 (1965): 308–40.
——. *Padua in the Age of Dante*. London, 1966.
Ianziti, Gary. *Humanistic Historiography under the Sforzas: Politics and Propaganda in Fifteenth-Century Milan*. Oxford, 1988.
Jaeger, Stephen C. *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939–1210*. Philadelphia, 1985.
Jennings, Margaret. "Monks and the *Artes Praedicandi* in the time of Ranulph Higden." *Revue bénédictine* 86 (1976): 119–28.
Jones, Philip. "Communes and Despots: The City-State in Late-Medieval Italy." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 15 (1965): 71–96.

——. Review of Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, 1966). *History* 53 (1968): 410–13.
——. "Storia economica: Dalla caduta dell'Impero romano al secolo XIV." In *Storia d'Italia*, vol. 2.2. Turin, 1974.
——. *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria*. Oxford, 1997.
Jordan, Edouard. *L'Allemagne et l'Italie aux Xlle et XIIIe siècles*. In *Histoire du moyen âge*. 4 vols. Paris, 1939.
Kajanto, Iiro. *Poggio Bracciolini and Classicism: A Study in Early Italian Humanism*. Helsinki, 1987.
Kantorowicz, Hermann. "The Political Sermon of a Medieval Jurist: Placentinus and his 'Sermo de Legibus.'" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 2 (1938): 22–41.
Keller, Hagen. *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien, 9. bis 12. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen, 1979.
——. "Adel und Rittertum: Ritterstand nach italienischen Zeugnissen des 11. bis 14. Jahrhunderts." In *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Josef Fleckenstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. L. Fenske, W. Rosener, and T. Zotz. Sigmaringen, 1984.
Kelley, Donald R. *Renaissance Humanism*. Boston, 1991.
Kemp, Martin. *The Science of Art: Optical Themes in Western Art from Brunelleschi to Seurat*. New Haven and London, 1990.
Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, 1963.
——. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1980.
King, Margaret L. *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance*. Princeton, 1986.
Kirsch, W. "Quilichinus oder Terrisius? Zur Autorschaft des Rhythmus 'Cesar Auguste multum mirabilis.'" *Philologus* 117 (1973): 250–63.
Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane. "Le chiavi fiorentine di Barbablù: L'apprendimento della lettura a Firenze nel XV secolo." *Bambini. Quaderni storici* 57 (1984): 765–92.
Klette, Theodor E. *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur der italienischen Gelehrtenrenaissance*. 3 vols. in 1. Hildesheim and New York, 1970.
Klopsch, Paul. *Einführung in die Mittellateinische Verslehre*. Darmstadt, 1972.
Koenig, John. *Il "popolo" dell'Italia del Nord nel XIII secolo*. Bologna, 1986.
Kohl, Benjamin. "The Works of Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna: A Catalogue of Manuscripts and Editions." *Traditio* 31 (1975): 349–67.
——. "Conversini (Conversano, Conversino), Giovanni (Giovanni da Ravenna)." *DBI* 28 (1983): 574–78.
——. *Padua Under the Carrara: 1318–1405*. Baltimore and London, 1998.
Koller, Hermann. *Die Mimesis in der Antike: Nachahmung, Darstellung, Ausdruck*. Berne, 1954.
Kristeller, Paul O. "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance." *Byzantion* 17 (1944–45): 346–74.
——. "Matteo de' Libri, Bolognese Notary of the Thirteenth Century, and his *Artes Dictaminis*." In *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, vol. 2. Fontes ambrosiani, no. 26. Milan, 1951.
——. *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains*. New York, 1961.
——. *Iter italicum*. 6 vols. Leiden and New York, 1963–97.
——. *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance*. Stanford, 1964.
——. *Renaissance Thought II. Papers on Humanism and the Arts*. New York and London, 1965.

——. *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, ed. M. Mooney. New York, 1979.
——. "Petrarcas Stellung in der Geschichte der Gelehrsamkeit." In *Italien und die Romania in Humanismus und Renaissance: Festschrift für Erich Loos zum 70. Geburtstage*, ed. K.W. Hempfer and E. Straub. Wiesbaden, 1983.
——. "Umanesimo e scolastica a Padova fino al Petrarca." *Medioevo* 11 (1985): 1–18.
——. *Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning*, ed. E.P. Mahoney. 2nd ed. Durham, N.C., 1992.
Kroll, Wilhelm. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart, 1924.
——. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. 7, s.v. "Rhetorik." Stuttgart, 1940.
La Vopa, Anthony J. "Conceiving a Public: Ideas and Society in Eighteenth-Century Europe." *Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992): 79–116.
Lagana, Francesca L. "Un maestro di scuola toscano del Duecento: Mino da Colle di Valdelsa." *Bollettino storico pisano* 58 (1989): 53–82. Rpt. in *Città e servizi sociali nell'Italia dei secoli XII–XV: Dodicesimo convegno di studi del Centro italiano di studi di storia e d'arte, Pistoia, 9–12 ott. 1987* (Pistoia, 1990).
Lagarde, Georges de. *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du Moyen Age*. 3rd ed. 5 vols. Louvain, 1956–70.
Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London, 1990.
Lamma, Paolo. "I comuni italiani e la vita europea." In *Storia d'Italia*, ed. G. Arnaldi et al., 2nd ed., vol. 1. Turin, 1965.
Lane, Frederic C. *Venice: A Maritime Republic*. Baltimore and London, 1973.
Lansing, Carol. *The Florentine Magnates: Lineage and Faction in a Medieval Commune*. Princeton, 1991.
Lanza, Antonio. *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Quattrocento: Storia e testi*. Rome, 1972.
——. *Polemiche e berte letterarie nella Firenze del primo Rinascimento (1375-1449)*. 2nd ed. Rome, 1989.
Larner, John. "Boccaccio and Lovato Lovati." In *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. Cecil Clough. New York, 1976.
Laue, Max. *Ferreto von Vicenza: Seine Dichtungen und sein Geschichtswerk*. Halle, 1884.
Lazzarini, Lino. *Paulo de Bernardo e i primordi dell'umanesimo in Venezia*. Geneva, 1930.
——. "Francesco Petrarca e il primo umanesimo a Venezia." In *Umanesimo europeo e umanesimo veneziano*, ed. V. Branca. Florence, 1963.
——. "Dux ille Dandulus." In *SCV* 2.
LeGoff, Jacques. "Alle origini del lavoro intellectuale in Italia: I problemi del rapporto fra la letteratura, l'università e le professioni." In *LI* 1.
Lejeune, Rita. "Le troubadour lombard et la 'galerie littéraire' satirique de Peire d'Alvernhe." *Marche romane* 25 (1975): 31–47.
Leo, Ulrich. "The Unfinished Convivio and Dante's Rereading of the Aeneid." *Mediaeval Studies* 13 (1951): 41–64.
Lesne, Emile. *Les livres, "scriptoria" et bibliothèques du commencement du VIIIe à la fin du XIe siècles*. Vol. 4 of *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique*. Lille, 1938.
Lesnick, Daniel. "Civic Preaching in the Early Renaissance: Giovanni Dominici's Florentine Sermons." In *Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento*, ed. T. Verdon and J. Henderson. Syracuse, N.Y., 1990.
Levi, Ezio. *Francesco di Vannozzo e la lirica nelle corti lombarde durante la seconda metà del secolo XIV*. Florence, 1908.
Lidonnici, G. "Polifemo." *Bullettino della Società dantesca italiana*, n.s., 18 (1911): 189–205.
——. "La corrispondenza poetica di Giovanni del Virgilio con Dante e il Mussato, e le postille di Giovanni Boccaccio." *Giornale dantesco*, n.s., 21 (1913): 205–42.

Limentani, Alberto. "Martino da Canal e *Les Estoire de Venise*." In *SCV* 1.
——. "L'epica in '*Lengue de France*': L'*Entrée d'Espagne* e Niccolò da Verona." In *SCV* 2.
Lindholm, Gudrun. *Studien zum Mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus: Seine Entwicklung und sein Abklingen in der Briefliteratur Italiens*. Stockholm and Uppsala, 1963.
Litta, conte Pompeo. "Albizzi di Firenze." *Famiglie italiane celebre*, fasc. 176, table 18. Turin, 1871.
Lo Monaco, Francesco. "Un nuovo testimonio (frammentario) del *Contra casus fortuitos* di Albertino Mussato." *IMU* 28 (1985): 107–36.
Lomazzi, Anna. "Primi monumenti del volgare." In *SCV* 1.
Longère, J. *La prédication médiévale*. Paris, 1983.
Longpré, P.E. "Les *distinctiones* de Fr. Thomas de Pavia, O.F.M." *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 16 (1923): 3–33.
Lord, Mary Louise. "Boccaccio's *Virgiliana* in the 'Miscellanea Latina.'" *IMU* 34 (1991): 127–97.
Lucchi, Piero. "Santacroce, il Salterio e il Babuino: Libri per imparare a leggere nel primo secolo della stampa." *Alfabetismo e cultura scritta*, ed. A. Bartoli-Langelli and A. Petrucci. *Quaderni storici* 38 (1978): 593–630.
Ludwig, Walter. *Litterae neolatinae: Schriften zur neulateinischen Literatur*. Munich, 1989.
Luiso, Francesco P. *Studi su l'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*, ed. Lucia Gualdo Rosa. Studi storici, no. 122–24. Rome, 1980.
Luzzati, M. "Le origini di una famiglia nobile pisana: Roncioni nei secoli XII e XIII." *Bulletino senese di storia patria* 73–75 (1966–68): 60–118.
Lyons, John D., and Stephen G. Nichols, eds. *Mimesis: From Mirror to Method, Augustine to Descartes*. Hanover, N.H., 1982.
Maggini, Francesco. *I primi volgarizzamenti dai classici latini*. Florence, 1952.
Mahoney, Edward P. "From the Medievals to the Early Moderns: Themes and Problems in Renaissance Political Thought." In *Les philosophies morales et politiques au Moyen Age: Actes du IXe. Congrès internationale de philosophie médiévale (Ottawa, du 17 au 22 août 1992)*, ed. B.C. Bazán et al., vol. 1. New York, 1995.
Maître, L. *Les écoles épiscopales et monastiques en Occident avant les universités (768–1180)*. 2nd ed. Paris, 1924.
Manacorda, Giuseppe. *Il medio evo*. Vol. 1 in 2 pts. of *Storia della scuola in Italia*. Milan and Naples, 1913.
Manera, Guido. *Ferreto dei Ferreti, preumanista vicentino*. Vicenza, 1949.
Manitius, Max, and P. Lehmann. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. 3 vols. Munich, 1911–31.
Mann, Nicholas. "The Manuscripts of Petrarch's *De remediis*: A Checklist." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 14 (1971): 57–90.
——. "Benintendi Ravagnani, il Petrarca, e l'umanesimo veneziano." In *Petrarca, Venezia e il Veneto*, ed. G. Padoan. Venice, 1976.
——. "Petrarca e la cancelleria veneziana." In *SCV* 2.
Manselli, Raoul. "La grande feudalità italiana tra Federico Barbarossa e i Comuni." In *Popolo e stato in Italia nell'età di Federico Barbarossa: Alessandria e la Lega lombarda*. Turin, 1970.
Marangon, Paolo. "Università, giudici e notai a Padova nei primi anni del dominio ezzeliniano (1237–1241)." *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 12 (1979): 1–62.
——. *Ad cognitionem scientiae festinare: Gli studi nell'Università e nei conventi di Padova nei secoli XIII e XIV*, ed. T. Pesenti. Trieste, 1997.
Marchesi, Concetti. "Due grammatici del medio evo." *Bullettino della Società filologica romana* 12 (1910): 19–56.

——. *Scritti minori di filologia e di letteratura*. 3 vols. Florence, 1978.
Mariani, Ugo. *Il Petrarca e gli Agostiniani*. Rome, 1946.
Marigo, Aristide. "Cultura letteraria e preumanistica nelle maggiori enciclopedie del '200." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 68 (1916): 1–42 and 289–326.
——. *I codici manoscritti delle Derivationes di Uguccione pisano*. Rome, 1936.
Marrou, H.I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. G. Lamb. New York, 1956.
Marsh, David. *The Quattrocento Dialogue: Classical Tradition and Humanist Innovation*. Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1980.
Martellotti, Guido. "Barzizza, Gasparino, (Gasparinus Barzizius, G. Bergomensis or Pergaminis)." *DBI* 7 (1965): 34–39.
——. *Scritti petrarcheschi*, ed. M. Feo and S. Rizzo. Studi sul Petrarca, no. 16. Padua, 1983.
Martin, Janet. "Classicism and Style in Latin Literature." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, with Carol Lanham. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.
Martin, John. "Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe." *American Historical Review* 102 (1997): 1309–42.
Martines, Lauro. *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists, 1390–1460*. London, 1963.
——. *Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence*. Princeton, 1968.
——. *Power and Imagination: City-States in Renaissance Italy*. New York, 1980.
Masséra, Aldo F. "Jacopo Allegretti da Forlì." *Atti e memorie della reale Deputazione di storia patria per le provincie di Romagna*, 4 ser., no. 15 (1925–26): 135–203.
May, E. *The De Jerusalem celesti and the De Babylonia civitate infernali of Giacomino da Verona*. London, 1930.
Mazzoni, Francesco. "Per Francesco da Barberino." *Miscellanea storica della Valdelsa* 70 (1964): 173–98.
Mazzuconi, Daniela. "Per una sistemazione dell'epistolario di Gasparino Barzizza." *IMU* 20 (1977): 185–241.
McGarry, Daniel D. "Educational Theory in the *Metalogicon* of John of Salisbury." *Speculum* 23 (1948): 659–75.
McKeon, Richard. "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity." *Modern Philology* 34 (1934): 1–35. Rpt. in *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern*, ed. R.S. Crane. Chicago, 1952.
——. "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 17 (1942): 1–32.
McManamon, John. "Innovation in Early Humanist Rhetoric: The Oratory of Pier Paolo Vergerio the Elder." *Rinascimento*, n.s., 22 (1982): 3–32.
——. *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism*. Princeton, 1989.
——. *Pierpaolo Vergerio the Elder, ca. 1369–1444: The Humanist as Orator*. Binghamton, 1996.
——. *Sermones decem pro sancto Hieronimo*. Tempe, Ariz., 1999.
Medin, A. "Letteratura poetica viscontea." *Archivio storico lombardo* 12 (1885): 568–81.
Mehl, Ernst. *Die Weltanschauung des Giovanni Villani: Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte Italiens im Zeitalter Dantes*. Hildesheim, 1973.
Meiss, Millard. *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death*. Princeton, 1984.
Mercer, R.G.G. *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza with Special Reference to His Place in Paduan Humanism*. London, 1979.
Miglio, Massimo. "Colonna, Landolfo." *DBI* 27 (1982): 349–52.
Migliorini, Bruno. *Storia della lingua italiana*. Florence, 1960.
Miola, A. "Le scritture in volgare dei primi tre secoli della lingua ricercate nei codici della Biblioteca nazionale di Napoli." *Propugnatore* 13 (1880): 124–130.

Mommsen, Theodore E. "Petrarch's Conception of the 'Dark Ages.'" *Speculum* 17 (1942): 226–42. Rpt. in his *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Eugene F. Rice, Jr. Ithaca, N.Y., 1959.

Monfrin, Jacques. "Humanisme et traductions au Moyen Age: Les traducteurs et leur public en France au Moyen Age." In *L'Humanisme médiéval dans les littératures romanes du XIIe au XIVe siècle*, ed. A. Fourrier. Paris, 1964.

Monti, Carla Maria. "I codice Berkeley, Bancroft Library, f 2MS AC 13 c 5." *IMU* 22 (1979): 396–412.

——. "Per la fortuna della *Questio de prole*: I manoscritti." *IMU* 28 (1985): 71–95.

Monticolo, Giovanni. "Poesie latine del principio del secolo XIV nel codice 277 ex Brera al reale Archivio di Stato di Venezia." *Il propugnatore*, n.s., 3, no. 2 (1890): 244–97.

Moos, Peter von. *Hildebert von Lavardin, 1056–1133: Humanitas an der Schwelle des Höfischen Zeitalters*. Pariser Historische Studien, no. 3. Stuttgart, 1965.

Mor, G.C. "Il trattato di Costanza e la vita comunale italiana." *Popolo e stato in Italia nell'età di Federico Barbarosa: Alessandria e la lega lombarda*. Turin, 1970.

Mortensen, Lars B. "Leonardo Bruni's *Dialogus*: A Ciceronian Debate on the Literary Culture of Florence." *Classica et mediaevalia* 37 (1986): 259–302.

Mostra di codici romanzi delle biblioteche fiorentine: VIII Congresso internazionale di studi romanzi (3-8 aprile 1956). Florence, 1957.

Müller, Hubert. *Früher Humanismus in Öberitalien: Albertino Mussato: Ecerinis*. Frankfurt-am-Main and New York, 1987.

Mundy, John H. "In Praise of Italy: The Italian Republics." *Speculum* 64 (1989): 815–34.

Munk Olsen, B. *L'Etude des auteurs classiques latins aux IXe et XIIe siècles*. 3 vols. in 4. Paris, 1982–88.

Murphy, James J. *Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography*. Toronto, 1973.

——. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley and New York, 1974.

Muttoni, L. "Simone d'Arezzo canonico a Verona." *IMU* 22 (1979): 171–207.

Nada Patrone, Anna Maria, and Gabriella Arnaldi. "Comuni e signori nell'Italia settentrionale: Il Piemonte e la Liguria." In *Storia d'Italia*, vol. 5. Turin, 1965.

Najemy, John M. *Corporatism and Consensus in Florentine Electoral Politics, 1280–1400*. Chapel Hill, 1982.

——. "The Dialogue of Power in Florentine Politics." In *City-States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, ed. A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, and J. Emlen. Ann Arbor, 1991.

——. *Between Friends: Discourses of Power and Desire in the Machiavelli-Vettori Letters of 1513–1515*. Princeton, 1993.

——. "Brunetto Latini's 'Politica.'" *Dante Studies* 112 (1994): 33–51.

Namier, Lewis R. *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*. 2 vols. London, 1929.

Nauert, Charles. *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*. Cambridge, 1995.

Nederman, Cary J. "The Union of Wisdom and Eloquence before the Renaissance: The Ciceronian Orator in Medieval Thought." *Journal of Medieval History* 18 (1992): 75–95.

——. *Community and Consent: The Secular Political Theory of Marsiglio of Padua's Defensor Pacis*. Lanham, Md., 1995.

Nobili, M. "L'evoluzione delle dominazioni marchionali in relazione alla dissoluzione delle circoscrizioni marchionali e comitali e allo sviluppo della politica territoriale dei comuni cittadini dell'Italia centro-settentrionale (secoli XI e XII)." *La cristianità dei secoli XI e XII in Occidente: Coscienza e strutture di una*

società. Atti del'VIII Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 30 giugno–5 luglio 1980, Mendola, 1983).
de Nolhac, Pierre. *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*. 2 vols. Paris, 1907.
Norden, Eduoard. *Die Antike Kunstprosa vom 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. 4th ed. 2 vols. Leipzig and Berlin, 1923.
Nordström, J. *Moyen Age et Renaissance: Essai historique*, trans. T. Hammar. Paris, 1933.
Nothdurft, Klaus-Dieter. *Studien zum Einfluß Senecas auf die Philosophie und Theologie des zwölften Jahrhunderts*. Leiden and Cologne, 1963.
Novati, Francesco. *Carmina medii aevi*. Turin, 1883.
——. "Un umanista fabrianese del secolo XIV: Giovanni Tinti." *Archivio storico per le Marche e per l'Umbria* 2 (1885): 103–57.
——. "Luigi Gianfigliazzi, giuresconsulto ed oratore fiorentino del sec. XIV." *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 3 (1889): 440–47.
——. "Sul riordinamento dello studio fiorentino nel 1385." *Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana* 4 (1896): 318–33.
——. "Se a Vicenza nei primi del secolo quattordici siasi impartito pubblico insegnamento di provenzale." *Rendiconti del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*, 2nd ser. 30 (1897): 211–20.
——. "Gherardo da Castelfiorentino: Notizie e documenti." In *Miscellanea storica della Valdelsa* 6 (1898): 196–203.
——. *Indagini e postille dantesche*. Bologna, 1899.
——. "Di un'ars punctandi erroneamente attribuita a Francesco Petrarca." *Rendiconti del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*, 2nd ser., 42 (1909): 84–96.
——. "Nuovi aneddoti sul cenacolo letterario padovano del primissimo Trecento." In *Scritti storici in memoria di Giovanni Monticolo*. Venice, 1922.
——. *Freschi e minii del Dugento*. Milan, 1925.
——. *Le origini, continuate e compiute da Angelo Monteverdi*. Milan, 1926.
O'Malley, John. *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine, and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c. 1450–1521*. Durham, N.C., 1979.
——. "Egidio da Viterbo, O.S.A., e il suo tempo." *Studia augustiniana historica* 9 (1983): 68–84.
——. "Grammar and Rhetoric in the *Pietas* of Erasmus." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988): 81–98.
Ori, Carmela. *L'eloquenza civile italiana nel secolo XVI*. Rocca S. Casciano, 1907.
Orlandi, Giovanni. "Caratteri della versificazione dattilica." In *Retorica e poetica tra i secoli XII e XIV: Atti del secondo Convegno internazionale di studi dell'Associazione per il Medioevo e l'Umanesimo latini, in onore e memoria di Ezio Franceschini, Trento e Rovereto, 3–5 ottobre, 1986*, ed. C. Leonardi and E. Menesto. Perugia, 1988.
Ornato, Ezio. *Jean Muret et ses amis: Nicolas de Clamanges et Jean de Montreuil*. Geneva, 1969.
Otte, Gerhard. *Dialektik und Jurisprudenz: Untersuchungen zur Methode der Glossatoren*. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1971.
Ottokar, Nicola. *Il comune di Firenze alla fine del Duecento*. Florence, 1926.
——. *Studi comunali e fiorentini*. Florence, 1948.
Paetow, Louis. *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric*. Urbana and Champagne, Ill., 1910.
Palma, M. "Castiglionchio, Lapo da." *DBI* 22 (1979): 40–44.
——. "Ceffi, Filippo." *DBI* 23 (1979): 320–321.
Panella, E. *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et histoire*, s.v. "Remi dei Girolami."
——. *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et historie*, s.v. "Tolomée de Lucques."

Paoletti, L. "Castellano di Bassano." *DBI* 21 (1978): 639–41.
Paoli, Ugo E. *Prose e poesie latine di scrittori italiani*. Florence, 1930.
Paradisi, Bruno. *Studi sul medioevo giuridico*. 2 vols. Rome, 1987.
Paré, G., A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay. *La renaissance au XIIe siècle: Les écoles et l'enseignement*. Paris and Ottawa, 1933.
Park, Katharine. "The Readers at the Florentine Studio according to Communal Fiscal Records (1357–1380, 1413–1446)." *Rinascimento*, 2nd. ser., 20 (1980): 249–310.
Parodi, E.G. "I rifacimenti e le traduzioni italiane dell'*Eneide* di Virgilio prime del Rinascimento." *Studi di filologia romanza* 2 (1887): 97–368.
——. "Intorno al testo delle epistole di Dante e al cursus." *Bullettino della Società dantesca italiana*, n.s., 19 (1912): 249–75.
——. "Le tragedie di Seneca e la *Divina comedia*." *Bulletino della Società dantesca italiana*, n.s., 21 (1914): 241–52.
Parronchi, A. *Studi su la dolce prospettiva*. Milan, 1964.
Pascal, Carlo. *Letteratura latina medievale: Nuovi saggi e note critiche*. Catania, 1909.
Pasqui, U. "La biblioteca d'un notaro aretino del secolo XIV." *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 4 (1889): 250–55.
Pasquini, Emilio. "Convenevole da Prato." *DBI* 28 (1983): 563–68.
Pellegrin, E. *Manuscrits de Pétrarque dans les bibliothèques de France*. Padua, 1966.
——. *Manuscrits de Pétrarque à la Bibliothèque vaticane: Supplément au catalogue de Vattasso*. Padua, 1976.
Perroy, Edouard. "Charles V et la Traité de Brétigny." *Le Moyen Age* 29 (1928): 264–81.
——. *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Richard II*. The Camden Society, 3rd. ser., no. 48. London, 1933.
Petrobelli, Pierluigi. "La musica nelle cattedrali e nelle città ed i suoi rapporti con la cultura letteraria." In *SCV* 2.
Petrocchi, Giorgio. *Vita di Dante*. Rome and Bari, 1984.
——. "La Toscana nel Duecento." In *LI* 7.1.
——. *Itinerari danteschi*. Milan, 1994.
Petrucci, Armando. "Libro, scritture e scuole." In *La scuola nell'Occidente latino dell'alto medioevo*. Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, no. 19. Spoleto, 1972.
——. Review of M.T. Casella, *Tra Boccaccio e Petrarca: I volgarizzamenti di Tito Livio e di Valerio Massimo* (Padua, 1962). *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 2 (1984): 369–87.
Piastra, C.M. "Nota sull'Annayde di Bonifacio veronese." *Aevum* 28 (1954): 505–21.
——. "Nota sulla Veronica di Bonifacio veronese." *Aevum* 33 (1959): 356–81.
Pigman, G.W., III. "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980): 1–32.
——. "Barzizza's Studies of Cicero." *Rinascimento*, 2nd. ser., 21 (1981): 123–63.
Pocock, J.G.A. "The Concept of a Language and the *Métier d'Historien*: Some Considerations on Practice." In his *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*. New York, 1971.
Polidori, F. "Voci latino-barbare." *Archivio storico italiano* 16 (1850): cix–xv.
Polizzi, Carlo. "Rolandinus Paduanus, professor gramatice facultatis." *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 17 (1984): 231–32.
Poppi, P. "Ricerche sulla vita e cultura del notaio e cronista veneziano Lorenzo de Monacis, cancelliere cretese (c. 1351–1428)." *Studi veneziani* 9 (1967): 153–86.
Power, James M. *Albertanus of Brescia: The Pursuit of Happiness in the Early Thirteenth Century*. Philadelphia, 1992.
Pratesi, A. "Balbi, Giovanni (Iohannes Balbus, de Balbis, de Ianua)." *DBI* 5 (1963): 369–70.

Pryds, D.N. "The Politics of Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Naples: Robert d'Anjou (1309–1343) and His Sermons." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1994.

Quaglio, Antonio E. *Enciclopedia dantesca*, 2nd rev. ed., s.v. "Commedia."

——. "I poeti della *Magna curia* siciliana." In *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 1. Ed. Emilio Pasquini and Antonio E. Quaglio. Vol. 1.1 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi*. Bari, 1970.

——. "I poeti siculo-toscani." In *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 1. Ed. Emilio Pasquini and Antonio E. Quaglio. Vol. 1.1 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi*. Bari, 1970.

——. Quaglio, A.E. "La poesia realistica." In *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 2. Ed. N. Mineo, Emilio Pasquini, and Antonio E. Quaglio. Vol. 1.2 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi*. Bari, 1970.

——. "Retorica, prosa e narrativa del Duecento." In *Il Duecento dalle origini a Dante*, vol. 2. Ed. N. Mineo, Emilio Pasquini, and Antonio E. Quaglio. Vol. 1.2 of *Letteratura italiana: Storia e testi*. Bari, 1970.

Quillet, Jeannine. *La philosophie politique de Marsile de Padoue*. Paris, 1970.

Quint, David. "Humanism and Modernity: A Reconsideration of Bruni's Dialogues." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 423–45.

Radding, Charles M. *A World Made by Men: Cognition and Society, 400–1200*. Chapel Hill, 1985.

——. *The Origins of Medieval Jurisprudence: Pavia and Bologna 850–1150*. New Haven, 1988.

Raimondi, Ezio. "Correzioni medioevali, correzioni umanistiche e correzioni petrarchesche nella lettera VI del libro XVI delle *Familiares*." *Studi petrarcheschi* 1 (1948): 125–33.

——. "Dante e il mondo ezzeliniano." In *Dante e la cultura veneta*. Florence, 1966.

Rand, E.K. "The Classics in the Thirteenth Century." *Speculum* 4 (1929): 249–69.

Rawski, C.H. "Notes on the Rhetoric in Petrarch's *Invective contra medicum*." In *Francis Petrarch, Six Centuries Later: A Symposium*, ed. Aldo Scaglione. Chicago, 1975.

Remer, Gary. *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration*. University Park, Penn., 1996.

Renucci, Paul. *L'aventure de l'humanisme européen au Moyen Age (IVe–XIVe siècle)*. Paris, 1953.

Ricci, P.G. "La tradizione dell'invettiva tra il Medioevo e l'Umanesimo." *Lettere italiane* 26 (1974): 405–14.

Renzi, Lorenzo. "Il francese come lingua letteraria e il franco-lombardo: L'epoca carolingia nel Veneto." In *SCV* 1.

Riché, R. *Les écoles et l'enseignement dans l'Occident chrétien de la fin du Ve siècle au milieu du XIe siècle*. Paris, 1979.

Rico, Francisco. *Lectura del Secretum*. Vol. 1 of *Vida u obra de Petrarca*. Studi sul Petrarca, no. 4. Padua, 1974.

——. "Ubi puer, ibi senex: Un libro de Hans Baron y el *Secretum*." *Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell'umanesimo: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Firenze, 19–22 maggio, 1991. Quaderni petrarcheschi* 9–10. Florence 1992–93: 165–237.

Riessner, Claus. *Die Magnae Derivationes des Uguccione da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie*. Rome, 1965.

Rizzo, Sylvia. "Il latino nell'Umanesimo." In *LI* 5.

——. "Il latino di Petrarca." In *The Uses of Greek and Latin. Historical Essays*, ed. A.C. Dionisotti, A. Grafton, and J. Kraye. Warburg Institute Surveys and Texts, no. 16. London,1988.

——. "Il latino del Petrarca e il latino dell'umanesimo." *Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell'umanesimo. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Firenze, 19–22 maggio, 1991. Quaderni petrarcheschi*, 9–10. Florence, 1992-93: 349–65.

Robathan, Dorothy, and F.E. Cranz. "Persius." In *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, ed. F.E. Cranz, vol. 3. Washington, D.C., 1976.
Roberts, P.B. *Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante: Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton*. Toronto, 1968.
Robey , D., and J. Law. "The Venetian Myth and the *De republica veneta* of Pier Paolo Vergerio." *Rinascimento*, 2nd. ser., 15 (1975): 3–59.
Romanin, S. *Storia documentata di Venezia*. 10 vols. Venice, 1853–69.
Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Le corti medievali." In *LI*. 1.
Ronconi, G. *Le origini delle dispute umanistiche sulla poesia (Mussato e Petrarca)*. Rome, 1976.
Rondinini, G. Soldi. "Cermenate, Giovanni." *DBI* 23 (1979): 768–71.
de Rosa, Daniela. *Coluccio Salutati: Il cancelliere e il pensatore politico*. Florence, 1980.
———. *Alle origini della Repubblica fiorentina: Dai consoli al "Primo Popolo" (1172–1260)*. Florence, 1995.
Rosier, Irène. "Mathieu de Bologne et les divers aspects du prémodisme." In *Insegnamento della logica a Bologna nel XIV secolo*, ed. D. Buzzetti, M. Ferriani, and A. Tabarroni. Bologna, 1992.
Ross, Braxton W. "Giovanni Colonna, Historian at Avignon." *Speculum* 45 (1970): 533–63.
———. "New autographs of fra Giovanni Colonna." *Studi petrarcheschi* 2 (1985): 211–30.
———. "The Tradition of Livy in *Mare historiarum* of Fra Giovanni Colonna." *Studi petrarcheschi*, n..s., 6 (1989): 70–86.
Rossi, Vittorio. *Il Quattrocento*. Milan, 1938.
Rubinstein, Nicolai. "The Beginnings of Political Thought in Florence." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5 (1942): 198–227.
———. "Municipal Progress and Decline in the Italy of the Communes." In *Fritz Saxl, 1890–1948: A Volume of Memorial Essays from His Friends in England*, ed. D.J. Gordon. London, 1957.
———. "Marsilius of Padua and Italian Political Thought of His Time." In *Europe in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. J.R. Hale, J.R.L. Highfield, and B. Smalley. Evanston, Ill., 1965.
Rusconi, R. *Predicazione e vita religiosa nella società italiana da Carlo Magno alla controriforma*. Turin, 1981.
Ryan, Mary Bride. "John of Salisbury on the Arts of Language in the Trivium." Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1958.
Sabbadini, Remigio. *Storia del ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della Rinascenza*. Turin, 1885.
———. *Studi di Gasparino Barzizza su Quintiliano e Cicerone*. Livorno, 1886.
———. *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini veronese*. Catania, 1896.
———. *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*. 2 vols. Florence, 1905–14. Reprographic rpt., ed. Eugenio Garin (Florence, 1967).
———. "Postille alle Epistole inedite di Lovato." *Studi medievali* 2 (1906–07): 255–62.
———. *Storia e critica di testi latini*. Catania, 1914. Rpt. Padua, 1971.
———. *Giovanni da Ravenna: Insigne figura d'umanista (1343–1408)*. Como, 1924.
———. "Vittorino da Feltre, studente padovano." *Rivista pedagogica* 21 (1928): 629–33.
———. "Delle nuove lettere di Gasparino Barzizzi." *Rendiconti del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*, 2nd ser., 62 (1929): 881–90.
———. Review of Marco di Franco, *Dialogi a Vergerio di Leonardo Bruni (*Catania, 1929). *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 96 (1930): 128–31.
———. *Classici e umanisti da codici ambrosiani*. Florence, 1933.
Saitta, Giuseppe. *Il pensiero italiano nell'Umanesimo e nel Rinascimento*. 3 vols. Florence, 1961.

Sambin, Paolo. "Le relazioni tra Venezia, Padova e Verona all'inizio del secolo XIV." *Atti dell'Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti* 111 (1952–53): 205–15.

Santini, Emilio. "La produzione volgare di Leonardo Bruni aretino e il suo culto per 'le tre corone fiorentine.'" *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 60 (1912): 289–339.

——. *Firenze e i suoi "oratori" nel Quattrocento*. Milan, 1922.

Santosuosso, Antonio. "Leonardo Bruni Revisited: A Reassessment of Han Baron's Thesis on the Influence of the Classics in the *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*." In *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society: Essays Presented to J.R. Lander*, ed. J.K. Rowe. Toronto and London, 1986.

Scaglione, Aldo. *Knights at Court: Courtliness, Chivalry, and Courtesy from Ottonian Germany to the Italian Renaissance*. Berkeley and Oxford, 1991.

Scalia, Giuseppe. "Il carme pisana sull'impresa contro i Saraceni del 1087." in *Studi di filologia romanza offerti a Silvio Pellegrini*. Padua, 1971.

——. "'Romanitas' pisana tra XI e XII secolo: Le iscrizioni romane del duomo e la statua del console Rodolfo." *Studi medievali*, 3rd. ser., 13 (1972): 791–843.

Scarpati, Claudio. "Vincenzo di Beauvais e la letteratura italiana del Trecento." *IMU* 19 (1976): 103–31.

Schaller, Hans. "Die Kanzlei Kaiser Friedrichs II: Ihr Personal und ihr Sprachstil: Zweiter Teil." *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftengeschichte, Siegel– und Wappenkunde* 4 (1958): 264–327.

Schneider, Johannes. *Die Vita Heinrici IV und Sallust: Studien zu Stil und Imitatio in der mittellateinischen Prosa*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, no. 49. Berlin, 1965.

Segre, Cesare. *Volgarizzamenti del Due e Trecento*. Turin, 1953.

——. *Lingua, stile e società: Studi sulla storia della prosa italiana*. Milan, 1963.

——. "Bartolomeo da San Concordio (Bartolomeo Pisano)." *DBI* 6 (1964): 768–70.

Seidlmayer, Michael. *Wege und Wandlungen des Humanismus: Studien zu seiner politischen, ethischen, religiösen Problemen*. Göttingen, 1965.

Seigel, Jerrold. "'Civic humanism' or 'Ciceronian Rhetoric'? The Culture of Petrarch and Bruni." *Past and Present* 34 (1966): 3–48.

——. *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism: The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom, Petrarch to Valla*. Princeton, 1968.

Shepard, Laurie. *Courting Power: Persuasion and Politics in the Early Thirteenth Century*. New York and London, 1999.

Sigmund, Paul. "The Influence of Marsilius of Padua on Fifteenth-Century Conciliarism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23 (1962): 392–402.

Simone, Franco. *Il Rinascimento francese: Studi e ricerche*. Turin, 1961.

——. "Il Petrarca e la sua concezione ciclica della storia." In *Arte e storia: Studi in onore di Leonello Vincenti*. Turin, 1965.

——. *The French Renaissance*, trans. H. Gaston Hall. London, 1969.

Siraisi, Nancy G. *Arts and Sciences at Padua: The Studium of Padua before 1350*. Toronto, 1973.

——. *Taddeo Alderotti and His Pupils: Two Generations of Italian Medical Learning*. Princeton, 1981.

Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. 2 vols. New York and London, 1978.

——. "Prehumanist Origins of Republican Ideas." In *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, ed. G. Bock, Q. Skinner, and M. Viroli. Cambridge and New York, 1990.

Skutsch, O. "Textual Studies in the *Bucolics* of Marcus Valerius." In *Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed. Charles Henderson. 2 vols. Rome, 1964.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed. Oxford, 1983.
Smith, Christine. *Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence 1400–1470*. New York and Oxford, 1992.
Sottili, A. "Postille all'epistolario di Coluccio Salutati." *Romanische Forschungen* 79 (1967): 585–86.
——. "La questione ciceroniana in una lettera di Francesco Zabarella a Francesco Petrarca." In *Università e cultura: Studi sui rapporti italo-tedeschi nell età dell'umanesimo*. Goldbach, Germany, 1993. Orig. pub. *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 6 (1973): 25–57.
Soubiran, Jean. "Prosodie et métrique des 'Bella parisiae urbis' d'Abbon." *Journal des Savants* 300 (1965): 204–331.
Southern, Richard W. *The Making of the Middle Ages*. New Haven, 1953.
Spagnesi, Enrico. *Utiliter edoceri: Atti inediti degli ufficiali dello Studio fiorentino*. Milan, 1979.
——. "I documenti costitutivi della provvisione del 1321 allo statuto del 1388." In *Storia dell'Ateneo fiorentino: Contributi di studio*, vol. 1. Florence, 1986.
Speroni, G.B. "Sulla tradizione manoscritta del *Fiore di retorica*." *Studi di filologia italiana* 28 (1970): 5–53.
Spicq, C. *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge*. Paris, 1944.
Squarotti, G.B., F. Bruni, and U. Dotti. *Dalle origini al Trecento*. Vol. 1.1 of *Storia della civiltà letteraria italiana*. Turin, 1990.
Stadter, Philip. "Planudes, Plutarch, and Pace of Ferrara." *IMU* 16 (1973): 137–62.
Stinger, Charles L. *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance*. Albany, N.Y., 1977.
Stocchi, Manlio P. "Un chapître d'histoire littéraire aux XIVe et XVe siècles: Seneca *poeta tragicus*." In *Les tragédies de Sénèque et le théâtre de la Renaissance*, ed. J. Jacquot. Paris, 1964.
——. "La biblioteca del Petrarca." In *SCV* 2.
——. "Scuola e cultura umanistica fra due secoli." In *SCV* 3.
Stock, B. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton, 1983.
Sundby, Thor. *Albertani brixiensis: Liber consolationis et consilii*. Copenhagen and London, 1873.
Surdich, Francesco. "Colonna, Giovanni." *DBI* 27 (1982): 337-38.
Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford, 1966.
Tabacco, Giovanni. "Nobilità e potere ad Arezzo in età comunale." *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 15 (1974): 1–24.
——. "Nobili e cavalieri a Bologna e a Firenze fra XII e XIII secolo." *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 17 (1976): 41–79.
——. *Egemonie sociali e strutture del potere nel medioevo italiano*. 2nd ed. Turin, 1979.
——. "Su nobilità e cavalleria nel medioevo: Un ritorno a Marc Bloch?" *Rivista storica italiana* 91 (1979): 5–25. Rpt. in *Studi di storia medievale e moderno per Ernesto Sestan*, vol. 1. Florence, 1980.
——. *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of Political Rule*, trans. R.B. Jensen. Cambridge and New York, 1989.
Tamassia, N. *Odolfredo. Studio storico-giuridico*. Bologna, 1894. Also published in *Atti e memorie della deputazione di storia patria per le province di Romagna*, 3rd ser., 11 (1893): 183–225, and 12 (1894):1–83 and 330–390.
Tanturli, Giuliano. "Cino Rinuccini e la scuola di Santa Maria in Campo." *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 17 (1976): 625–74.
——. "Rapporti del Brunelleschi con gli ambienti letterari." In *Brunelleschi: La sua opera e il suo tempo*. 2 vols. Florence, 1980.

——. "Volgarizzamenti e ricostruzione dell'antico: I casi della terza e quarta deca di Livio e di Valerio Massimo: la parte del Boccaccio (a proposito di un'attribuzione)." *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 27 (1986): 811–88.
Tateo, F. "La raccolta delle *Facezie* e lo stile 'comico' di Poggio." In *Poggio Bracciolini, 1380–1980: Nel VI centenario della morte*, ed. R. Fubini et al. Florence, 1982.
Terracini, B. "Appunti sui *Parlamenti ed epistole* in antico dialetto piemontese." *Romania* 40 (1911): 431–39.
Thomas, A. *Francesco da Barberino et la littérature provençale en Italie au moyen âge*. Paris, 1883.
Thrall, W.F., and A. Hibbard. *A Handbook of Literature*, revised and enlarged by C.H. Holman. New York, 1960.
Trillitzsch, Winfried. "Die Lateinische Tragödie bei den Prähumanisten von Padua." In *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Önnerfors, J. Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner. Darmstadt, 1973.
Trinkaus, Charles. "Humanist Treatises on the Status of the Religious: Petrarch, Salutati, Valla." *Studies in the Renaissance* 11 (1964): 7–45.
——. *"In Our Image and Likeness": Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*. 2 vols. London, 1970. Rpt. 1995.
——. *The Poet as Philosopher: Petrarch and the Formation of Renaissance Consciousness*. New Haven, 1979.
——. "Coluccio Salutati's Critique of Astrology in the Context of His Natural Philosophy." *Speculum* 64 (1989): 46–68.
——. "Humanistic Dissidence: Florence Versus Milan, or Poggio Versus Valla?" In *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and C. Smyth. 2 vols. Florence, 1989.
——. "Lorenzo Valla's Anti-Aristotelian Natural Philosophy." *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 5 (1993): 279–335.
Troilo, Sigfrido. *Andrea Giuliano, politico e letterato veneziano del Quattrocento*. Genoa and Florence, 1932.
Troncarelli, F. "Casini, Bruno." *DBI* 21 (1978): 355–56.
Trovato, Paolo. Review of H. Haller, *Il Panfilo* (Florence, 1982). *Medioevo romanzo* 10 (1985): 137–45.
Tucci, Ugo. "I primi viaggiatori e l'opera di Marco Polo." In *SCV* 1.
Tunberg, T. "What is Buoncompagno's 'Newest Rhetoric'?" *Traditio* 42 (1986): 299–334.
Ullman, Berthold L. *The Origins and Development of Humanist Script*. Rome, 1960.
——. *The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati*. Medioevo e umanesimo, no. 4. Padua, 1963.
——. *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2nd ed. Rome, 1973.
Ullman, Walter. *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1961.
Usseglio, Leopoldo. *I marchesi di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante secoli XI e XII*. Biblioteca della Società storica subalpina, nos. 101–102. Turin, 1926.
Valeri, Nino. *La libertà e la pace: Orientamenti politici del Rinascimento italiano*. Turin, 1942.
Valerio, Giulia. "La cronologia dei primi volgarizzamenti dell'*Eneide* e la diffusione della *Commedia*." *Medioevo romanzo* 10 (1985): 1–18.
Vandelli, G. "Ancora sulla datazione della *Commedia*." *Studi danteschi* 15 (1931): 43–53.
Vasaly, Ann. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley, 1993.
Vasoli, C. "La trattativa politica a Firenze e a Milano." In *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations*, ed. S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, and C. Symth, vol. 1. Florence, 1989.
Velli, Giuseppe. "Sul linguaggio letterario di Giovanni del Virgilio." *IMU* 24 (1981): 137–58.

Vinay, Gustavo. "Studi sul Mussato: I. Il Mussato e l'estetica medievale." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 126 (1949): 113–59.
Vincenti, Eleanore. "Matteo dei Libri e l'oratoria pubblica e privata nel '200." *Archivio glottologico italiano* 54 (1969): 227–37.
Vitale, Vito. "Le fonti della storia medioevale genovese." *Storia di Genova dalle origini al tempo nostro*, ed. A.R. Scarsella, vol. 3. Milan, 1941–42.
Viti, P. "Ser Petracco, padre del Petrarca, notaio dell'età di Dante." *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 2 (1985): 1–14.
——. *Leonardo Bruni e Firenze: Studi sulle lettere pubbliche e private* (Rome, 1992).
Vossler, Karl. *Poetische Theorien in der italienischen Frührenaissance*. Litterarhistorische Forschungen no. 12. Berlin, 1900.
Wallach, Luitpold. *Alcuin and Charlemagne: Studies in Carolingian History and Literature*. Ithaca, N.Y., 1959.
Walser, Ernst. *Poggius Florentinus: Leben und Werke*. Berlin, 1914.
Walter, I., and M. Piccialuti. "Bartolomeo da Capua." *DBI* 6 (1964): 697–704.
Ward, John O. *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion and Commentary*. Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, fasc. 58. Turnhout, 1995.
Weiss, Roberto. "Lineamenti per una storia del primo umanesimo fiorentino." *Rivista storica italiana* 60 (1948): 349–66.
——. *Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo: Studi e testi*. Storia e letteratura, no. 27. Rome, 1949.
——. "Lovato Lovati (1241–1309)." *Italian Studies* 6 (1951): 3–28.
——. "Benvenuto Campesani (1250/55?–1323)." *Bollettino del Museo civico di Padova* 44 (1955): 129–44.
——. "La cultura preumanistica veronese e vicentina nel tempo di Dante." *Dante e la cultura veneta*, ed. V. Branca and G. Padoan. Florence, 1966.
——. *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy*. London, 1947. Rpt. New York, 1970.
White, John. *The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space*, 3rd. ed. Cambridge, Mass., 1987.
Whorf, Benjamin Lee. "Language, Thought, and Reality." In his *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings*, ed. John B. Carroll. Cambridge, Mass., 1973.
Wieruszowski, Helene. *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy*. Storia e letteratura, no. 121. Rome, 1971.
Wilcox, Donald. *In Search of God and Self: Renaissance and Reformation Thought*. Boston, 1975.
——. *The Measure of Times Past: Pre-Newtonian Chronologies and the Rhetoric of Relative Time*. Chicago, 1987.
Wilkins, E.H. *The Life of Petrarch*. Chicago and London, 1961.
Wirszubski, C. *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge, 1950.
Witt, Ronald G. "The *De tyranno* and Coluccio Salutati's View of Politics and Roman History." *Nuova rivista storica* 53 (1969): 434–74.
——. "Cino Rinuccini's *Risponsiva alla Invectiva di Messer Antonio Lusco*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 23 (1970): 133–49.
——. "The Rebirth of the Concept of Republican Liberty in Italy." In *Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, ed. Anthony Molho and John A. Tedeschi. Dekalb, Ill., 1971.
——. *Coluccio Salutati and His Public Letters*. Geneva, 1976.
——. "Coluccio Saluati and Contemporary Physics." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38 (1977): 667–72.
——. "Coluccio Salutati and the Conception of the *Poeta Theologus* in the Fourteenth Century." *Renaissance Quarterly* 30 (1977): 538–63.
——. "Medieval *Ars dictaminis* and the Beginnings of Humanism: A New Construction." *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982): 1–35.

——. *Hercules at the Crossroads: The Life, Work, and Thought of Coluccio Salutati.* Durham, N.C., 1983.
——. "On Bene of Florence's Conception of the French and Roman Cursus." *Rhetorica* 3 (1985): 77–98.
——. "Boncompagno and the Defense of Rhetoric." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986): 1–31.
——. "Medieval Italian Culture and the Origins of Humanism as a Stylistic Ideal." In *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. A. Rabil, vol 1. Philadelphia, 1988.
——. "What did Giovannino Read and Write? Literacy in Early Renaissance Florence." *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 6 (1995).
——. "AHR Forum: The *Crisis* after Forty Years." *American Historical Review* 101 (1996): 110–18.
Wood, Neal. *Cicero's Social and Political Thought.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988.
Woods, Marjorie Curry. "The Teaching of Writing in Medieval Europe." In *A Short History of Writing Instruction from Ancient Greece to Twentieth-Century America*, ed. James J. Murphy. Davis, Calif., 1990.
——. "A Medieval Rhetoric Goes to School—and to the University: The Commentaries on the *Poetria nova.*" *Rhetorica* 9 (1991): 55–65.
Woods-Marsden, Joanna. "'Ritratto al Naturale': Questions of Realism and Idealism in Early Renaissance Portraits." *Art Journal* 46 (1987): 209–16.
Zaccagnini, G. "Soffredi del Grazia e il suo volgarizzamento dei trattati morali d'Albertano da Brescia." *Bullettino storico pistoiese* 18 (1916): 114–22.
Zaccaria, Raffaella Maria. "Documenti di Biagio Guasconi e la sua famiglia." *Interpres* 11 (1991): 295–325.
Zaccaria, Vittorio. "Pier Candido Decembrio e Leonardo Bruni (notizie dell'epistolario del Decembrio)." *Studi medievali*, 3rd. ser., 8 (1967): 504–54.
——. "Le epistole e i carmi di Antonio Loschi durante il cancelleriato visconteo (con tredici inediti)." *Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Atti e Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 8th ser., vol. 18, fasc. 5 (1975): 369–443.
Zanella, G. "Riccobaldo e Livio." *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s., 6 (1989): 53–69.
Zanella, Giacomo. *Scritti varii di Giacomo Zanella.* Florence, 1877.
Zardo, Antonio. "Francesco Zabarella a Firenze." *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., 22 (1898): 1–22.
Zielinski, T. *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, 2nd ed. Leipzig and Berlin, 1908.
Zimmermann, T. Price. "Paolo Giovio and the Evolution of Renaissance Art Criticism." In *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. Cecil H. Clough. New York and Mancester, 1976.
de Zulueta, Francisco. "Footnotes to Savigny on Azo's Lectura in Codicum." In *Studi in onore di Pietro Bonfante nel XL anno d'insegnamento*, vol. 3. Milan, 1930.

INDEX OF PERSONS

degli Abati, Lamberto, 186
degli Abati, Megliore, 177
Accurso da Cremona 193
Adelard of Bath, 180
Aesop, 133, 216
degli Albanzani, Donato, 346
Albertano da Brescia, 58-62, 72, 92, 105, 109, 122, 170, 181, 425, 493, 499
Alberto della Piagentina, 189, 192-193
Alberto di Mandello, 139
Albertus Magnus, 201n, 216-17
degli Albizzi, Alberto, 444
degli Albizzi, Luca, 446
degli Albizzi, Maso, 446
degli Albizzi, Maso di Rinaldo, 446
degli Albizzi, Ormano, 446
degli Albizzi, Rinaldo, 446-47
Albornoz, Cardinal, 307
Alcuin of York, 12, 58, 320
Alderotti, Taddeo, 180
Aldobrandino dei Mezzabati, 84
Alexander, 478
degli Alfani, Gianni, 177
Alighieri, Dante, 84, 135, 145, 166, 178, 188-189, 199, 205, 214-23, 231-32, 236, 244, 248, 251, 254, 293, 323, 326, 330, 333-34, 348, 350, 367, 402, 435-37, 502
degli Allegretti, Jacopo, 349
Ambrose of Milan, 250, 256, 400
Andrea da Grosseto, 181
Andrea, Monte, 177
Anselm of Bezate, 13, 33
Anthony, Mark, 333
Apuleius, 227-28
Aquinas, Thomas, 62-63, 211-12, 322, 327, 441
Aristides, 412-14, 422, 467
Aristotle, 13, 15, 65, 150, 155, 158, 180, 201, 204, 211-12, 247-248, 254, 257-258, 319, 330, 334, 400, 483
Arsegino, 89, 496
Asellus (pseud. of Albertino Mussato), 101
Augustine, 24, 58, 173, 244, 249-250, 253-256, 258-259, 267, 270, 282, 326, 400
Augustine of Canterbury, 324
Ausonius, 167, 326
Azzo, 35

Balbus, 320
Barbaro, Francesco, 440, 447, 456, 463, 467
Baron, Hans, 386, 414, 419-24, 427, 428n-429n, 431, 432n, 452n, 455-56, 470, 479n-480n, 499
Bartolomeo da San Concordio, 187-89
Bartolomeo da Capua, 360
Barzizza, Gasparino, 387-88, 456, 462-66, 476, 490, 493, 499, 504, 512-13
Baxandall, Michael, 343n, 418, 502
Beatrice, 178, 215-16
Beccadelli, Antonio (known as Panormita), 484
Becker, Marvin, 424
Bene of Florence, 32, 182
Benvenuto da Imola, 224
Benzo da Alessandria, 138-139, 167-168, 282-83, 285, 291
Benedict de Sainte Maure, 85, 181
Bernard of Clairvaux, 326
Bichilino da Spella, 136-138
Biglia, Andrea, 489-93
Billanovich, Giuseppe, 18
Billanovich, Guido, 18
Biondo, Flavio, 339-42, 345, 350
Bissolo, Bellino, 52, 54, 66, 70-71, 101, 112, 168
Black, Robert, 196n, 225n
Blythe, James, 63n
Boattieri, Pietro, 509
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 2, 19-20, 92, 189, 193, 229-30, 255, 262-263, 290, 299, 319, 326, 338, 402, 435-37, 444
Boethius, 15, 24, 127, 189, 192-193, 215, 262, 293
Bonagiunta of Lucca, 177
Boncompagno da Signa, 33, 35, 38, 59, 88-89, 143, 182, 496
Boniface VIII, 120, 247
Bonifacio of Verona, 52, 66, 69-71, 94
Bouwsma, William, 3
Boyle, Marjorie O'Rourke, 252n-253n

Bracciolini, Poggio, 28, 81, 336, 338, 342, 387, 389, 392-95, 398-402, 433-34, 436, 445-46, 456, 464
Brucker, Gene, 424
Brunelleschi, Filippo, 502
Bruni, Francesco, 229, 298-99, 302, 346, 365, 444, 500
Bruni, Leonardo, 22, 26, 81, 92, 156, 170, 172, 205, 213, 230, 270, 287, 338-41, 344-45, 370, 372, 387, 392-98, 402-15, 417-24, 427-34, 437-43, 445-46, 448, 450-52, 454, 456-57, 460-61, 464, 468, 471-72, 474-75, 484-86, 488-89, 492, 497-99, 501-04, 512-14
Brutus (otherwise unidentified), 433
Brutus, Decimus, 487
Brutus, Junius, 487
Brutus, Marcus, 435-36
Buonincontro da Mantova, 112
Burley, Walter, 291
Buvalelli, 47

Caesar, Augustus, 155, 166, 212, 253, 333-334, 386, 408, 419-20
Caesar, Julius, 142-143, 155, 182, 205, 212, 227, 331-34, 368, 377-78, 385, 408-09, 419-20, 430, 436, 478, 488
Calderini, Giovanni, 360
Cambi, Neri, 187
Cambio da Poggibonsi, 227
da Camino family, 82, 141
Campesani, Benvenuto, 106, 162-163
Camposanpiero family, 82
Cane, Facino, 484
Canigiani, Elena, 235
de' Capelli, Pasquino, 320, 332
Capra, Bartolomeo, 484
Caresini, Raffaino, 468-72, 474-75
Caretto family, 47
Carrara family, 459-60, 462, 480
Carrara, Francesco il Vecchio, 281, 374, 378-79, 383
Carrara, Francesco Novello, 377-80
Carrara, Jacopo, 120, 153
de la Carvana, Peire, 47
Casini, Bruno, 229, 444
Cassiodorus, 58, 189
Cassius, 333, 435
Castellano da Bassano, 130, 134, 224
Castellion, Sébastien, 318
Catiline, 205
Cato the Censor (Cato the Elder), 84, 132-33, 153
Cato Uticensis (Cato the Younger), 332, 368
Catullus, 163, 167
Cavalcanti, Guido, 177
de la Cavarana, Peire. *See* de la Carvana, Peire.
Ceffi, Filippo, 184, 192
Cermenate, Giovanni, 168-169, 282, 513
Cermisone, Bartolomeo, 374, 377-79, 381
Charlemagne, 12, 42, 52, 166, 315
Charles II of Anjou, 103, 109, 225-26, 313
Charles of Valois, 96
Charles VI (king of France), 361
ser Chelli, Antonio, 444
Chrysoloras, Emanuel, 342, 372, 414
Chrysostom, John, 250
Cicero, 11-12, 15-16, 21, 24-25, 28, 32-33, 38, 58-60, 62, 65, 89,123, 183-85, 188-191, 201-205, 215, 240, 243-244, 249, 252-254, 256-259, 261-62, 264-265, 270, 274, 279-80, 289, 315-16, 318, 320, 325-26, 332, 340-41, 344-45, 350-53, 361, 363-64, 367-70, 372, 374-75, 377-78, 383-86, 389-90, 392-94, 396-97, 399-403, 411, 418, 425-26, 428, 430, 433, 436, 438, 440-43, 451, 462-66, 482-83, 493, 498-500, 502, 504, 510
dei Cinci, Rainaldo, 238
Cino da Pistoia, 177
Clement VI, 265
Cola di Rienzo, 288-89, 311, 359
Colonna family, 231
Colonna, Agapito, 281
Colonna, Giovanni, 233, 277
Colonna, Landolfo, 233, 283
Compagni, Dino, 180
Compagnino, 96, 99, 101
Conradin, 96, 109
Constantine the Great, 167
Convenevole da Prato, 214, 233-35, 249
Conversini, Giovanni, 339, 346, 456
Corbinelli, Angelo, 445
Corbinelli, Antonio, 445
Cornificius, 202
Cortesi, Paolo, 339, 343, 345, 387
Corvini, Giovanni, 492

Cremaschi, Giovanni, 90
Curio, Caius Scribonius, 368

Dandolo, Andrea, 469
Dante da Maiano, 51, 175, 177
Dante d'Alighieri. *See* Alighieri, Dante
Dardanus, 314
Dati, Goro, 452
Davanzati, Chiari, 177
Davis, Charles, 223
Decembrio, Pier Candido, 105, 477, 484-89; Uberto 477, 480-84
Dietaiuti, Bondio, 177
Dionigio di San Sepulcro, 250
Dominici, Giovanni, 335-36
Donati, Corso, 211
Donatus, 195
Donzella, Compiuta, 177
Duns Scotus, 245, 322, 327

Ennius, 265, 401
Ennodius, 324
Erasmus, Desiderius, 344, 361
Este family, 47, 82
Eusebius, 466

Faba, Guido, 136, 183, 354-55, 509
Facio, Bartolomeo, 387
de' Ferreti, Ferreto, 163-166, 168-170, 282, 311, 512-14
Filelfo, Francesco, 338, 447
Filippo da Santa Croce, 193
Filippo, Rustico, 177
Folchetto di Marseilles, 50
Folena, Gianfranco, 224n
Foscari, Francesco, 455
Francesco da Barberino, 220, 225, 227, 228
Freculf, 189
Frederick I (Barbarossa), 40, 488
Frederick II, 50, 55, 72-73, 164, 174, 314
Frederick of Austria, 153-154
Frescobaldi, Dino, 177
Fubini, Riccardo, 432n

Gasparino of Bergamo, 338
Gehl, Paul F., 196n
Gellius, 228
Gerbert, 13
Geremia da Montagnone, 113-14, 168, 325
Geri d'Arezzo, 92, 122, 224-27, 230, 264-265, 299, 319, 326, 351
Gherardo da Castelfiorentino, 227
Gherardo, Giovanni di (of Prato), 350
Giacomino da Verona, 84
Giambono, Bono, 179, 182, 185-86, 191, 199
Gianfigliazzi, Luigi di Teri di Nello, 363-64, 369, 428, 443
Gianni, Lapo, 177
Gilbert, Felix, 501
Giotto, 375, 417
Giovanni (otherwise unknown), 162
Giovanni da Ravenna. *See* Conversini, Giovanni, *and* Malpaghini, Giovanni
Giovanni di Geri d'Arezzo, 226
Giovannino da Mantova, 157, 161
Girolamo dei Remigi, 64, 425
Giuliani, Andrea, 465-67
Giustiniani, Leonardo, 468, 472-75, 503-04
Gouwens, Kenneth, 23
Gratian, 16
del Grazia, Soffredi, 181
Graziano, Giovanni B., 74n
Gregory the Great, 256, 324
Gregory VII, 16
Gregory XI, 306, 309
Grendler, Paul, 34n
Guarini, Guarino (da Verona), 294, 338, 341-43, 345, 456, 465
Guidotto of Bologna, 183-84, 205
Guinizelli, Guido, 177
Guittone d'Arezzo, 49-50, 177
Guizzardo da Bologna, 134, 196, 224

Hadrian, 315
Hankins, James, 423, 431n, 434n
Hannibal, 470
Henry of Gorizia, 153
Henry of Settimello 68, 71, 76, 79, 99, 102
Henry VI (Holy Roman Emperor), 44
Henry VII (Holy Roman Emperor), 109, 120-21, 130, 140-141, 143, 145-146, 150, 152, 164-165, 167, 169
Herde, Peter, 424
Herman the German, 180
Hildebert of Lavardin, 37-38, 76
Homer, 115, 216, 256, 368
Honorius of Autun, 85
Horace, 73, 90, 98, 100, 102-03, 133, 217, 233, 257, 262, 295

Innocent III, 186, 356
Isidore of Seville, 320
Isocrates, 240

Jacopo da Forlì, 322
Jacopo da Scarperia, 395, 445
Jacques de Lyons, 49
James of Viterbo, 201
Jeremiah, 250
Jerome, Saint, 232, 255-256, 282, 320, 326, 374, 379-83, 386, 400, 440, 450
John of Paris, 155, 247
John of Salisbury, 202-204
John the Baptist, 411
Jones, Philip, 63n-64n, 424
Josephus, 114
Justin, 99, 114
Juvenal, 73, 133, 226, 233

van Kempen, Ludwig, 265
Kennedy, George, 8-9
Kent, Dale, 424
Kent, William, 424
King, Margaret L., 455-56, 474-75
Kristeller, Paul Oskar, 1-5

Lactantius, 255
Ladislaus, King of Naples, 314
Lancia, Andrea, 190-191
Lancia, Manfredo 72
Lanfranchi da Pistoia, 50, 176
Lapo da Castiglionchio, 92, 224, 229, 298, 363-66, 369, 428, 443, 513-14
Latini, Brunetto, 21, 51, 59, 62, 66, 135, 173, 177-79, 181, 183-89, 198-199, 201-202, 204-210, 214-15, 227, 240, 243-244, 280, 352, 425, 428, 443, 454, 497
Laura, 250
Lentini, Giacomo, 50
Lentulus, 340
Leo III, 315
Ligario, Quintus, 378
Lindholm, Gudrun, 142n, 169n, 509-12, 514
Livy, 99, 114, 142-143, 168-69, 186, 189-193, 226, 239, 326
Loredan, Giorgio, 472, 474, 503-04
Lorris, Guillaume de, 198
Loschi, Antonio, 314, 372, 388-90, 403, 463-66
dei Lovati, Lovato, 17-18, 21-22, 30, 40, 52-53, 54, 56, 59, 65-66, 70-71, 78, 81, 84, 87, 93-112, 114-117, 120-23, 125-26, 130, 135, 138, 147, 155-156, 159, 161-163, 166, 168, 170-71, 199, 201, 207, 210, 219, 231, 235-36, 243, 246, 260, 282, 290-91, 296, 440, 442, 495-97, 500
Lucan, 94, 133, 182, 191-193, 217, 238, 295, 368
Ludwig of Bavaria, 146
Lupus (pseud. of Lovato dei Lovati), 101

Machiavelli, Niccolò, 146, 279, 501
Mainardini, Marsilio. *See* Marsilio of Padua.
Malaspina (attributed author of Istoria fiorentina), 179
Malaspina, Alberto, 47
Malaspina, Marquis of, 41
Malaspini, Ricordano, 179
Malatesta, Carlo, 349
Malpaghini, Giovanni, 263, 340-43, 345-51, 369-70, 372-74, 384, 390, 393-94, 428, 443, 445
Mansionarius (see Matociis, Giovanni di)
Marchetto da Padova, 113
Marco di Giovanni d'Arezzo, 350
Marinoni, Astolfino, 389
Marsili, Luigi, 400-401, 434, 444
Marsilio of Padua, 154-156, 210, 248, 421, 441
Marsilio of Santa Sophia, 322
Martial, 98, 100
Martin of Braga, 58
Martin of Troppau, 282-83
Martin V, 489
Martin, Janet, 37-38
Martines, Lauro, 444n-445n
Martino da Canale, 51
de Matociis, Giovanni, 166-168, 227, 282-83, 285, 291
Matteo dei Libri, 183-84, 355
McManamon, John, 371n-372n
de' Medici, Cosimo, 447
de' Medici, Giovanni di Bicci, 446-47
de' Medici, Lorenzo di Bicci 447
de' Medici, Piero di Cosimo 447
Mezzabati, Ugo, 99, 112
Mino da Colle, 136, 509
di ser Mino, Pietro, 445
Molho, Anthony, 424

Monachi, Bonaventura, 301
Monachi, Niccolò, 301-02
de' Monacis, Lorenzo, 468, 471-72, 474-75
Monferrato, Marquis of, 41
Montefeltro, Count of, 309
Morovelli, Pietro, 177
Munk Olsen, B., 31n-32n
Mussato, Albertino, 17-18, 28, 81, 84, 101, 105-12, 115-132, 134, 138-172, 196-197, 199, 201, 207, 210, 222, 224, 226, 230-31, 235-36, 243, 246, 252, 260, 264-265, 272-73, 291, 295-96, 299, 311, 319, 326, 337, 440, 491, 495, 512, 514

Najemy, John, 207n, 424-26, 499
Nederman, Cary J., 203n, 204n
Nelli, Francesco, 229, 256, 258, 298, 444
Niccoli, Niccolò, 401, 433-37, 439
Niccolò da Prato, 235
Niccolò di Duccio, 447
Nicholas II, 324
Nicholas V, 446

Odonetti, Giovanni Batista, 136
Oliari, Bartolomeo, 224, 325, 394
Orosius, 186, 191
Orsini, Ugolino, 300
Ovid, 73, 97-100, 102-03, 133, 181-82, 192, 198-199, 217, 238, 294-95, 297, 447

Pace da Ferrara (Pace da Friuli), 86, 114-16, 134
Palladius, 190
Palmieri, Matteo, 457
Pandolfini, Angelo, 444-45
Panormita (pseud. of Antonio Beccadelli), 484
Paolo da Teolo, 163
Papias, 320
Pastrengo, Giuglielmo, of Verona, 284-85
Paul, Saint, 123, 250, 256
Pecoraro da Mercatonuovo, 72
Pelacani, Biagio, 322
Pelavicino, Oberto, 72
Persius, 86, 89-90
dei Peruzzi, Lisa, 192
dei Peruzzi, Simone 192
Peter of Blois, 326
ser Petracco (Petrarch's father), 214, 231-33, 235
di ser Petracco, Gherardo (Petrarch's brother), 232, 251
Petrarca, Giovanni (Petrarch's son), 346
Petrarch (Francesco di ser Petracco), 2, 18-21, 23-28, 65, 70, 81, 87, 92, 111, 116, 118, 121, 123, 161, 167, 170, 173, 187, 189, 204-205, 230-40, 242-46, 248-294, 297-300, 311, 315-324, 326-27, 331-32, 335-39, 340-41, 344, 346-47, 351, 361-65, 367, 375-76, 383-85, 387, 392-93, 398-403, 414, 416-19, 435-37, 439-41, 443-44, 449, 495, 497-98, 500-04, 512-13
Petri, Riccardo, 190, 193
Philip IV, 247
Philip of Macedon, 312, 414
Philippe, Bishop of Cavillon, 233
Pier della Vigna, 50, 310
Pietro da Moglio, 122, 292-94, 298-99, 310
Pietro d'Abano 86-87, 149
Pietro dei Rossi, 314
Placentinus, 34-35, 92
Plano di Carpini, 228
Planudes, Maximus, 86
Platina, Bartolomeo (dei Sacchi), 338, 345, 387
Plato, 253-254, 256, 258-259, 395, 400, 480-83
Plautus, 279
Pliny the Elder, 227
Pliny the Younger, 224, 226-7
Plutarch, 86, 467
Polentone, Sicco, 464
Polo, Marco, 51
Pompey, 205, 368
Priscian, 295
Propertius, 96-100, 102, 133
Prosper of Aquitaine, 133, 216
Prudentius, 216
Pseudo-Quintilian, 485-86
Ptolemy of Lucca, 62-63, 156, 210-13, 421

Quidort, John, 155, 247.
Quintilian, 228, 340-41, 351, 364

Raimbaut de Vacqueiras, 41-42
Raimondo, Pietro, 459-62

Rainaldo dei Cinci, 238
Restoro d'Arezzo, 180
Riccobaldo of Ferrara, 113-114, 282-83, 291
Richard de Bury, 291
Ridolfi, Lorenzo, 444, 492
Rinuccini, Cino, 348, 366, 367-70, 373-74, 381, 402-03, 421, 428, 443-44, 451, 513-14
de la Riva, Bonvesin, 52, 66, 69-71
Robert of Anjou, King of Naples, 234, 360
Rolandino of Padua, 88-90, 93-94, 123, 139, 141-144, 167-68, 172, 496, 512, 514
Rolando da Piazzola, 110, 112, 147, 235-36
Rolando di Lovato, 95
Romano family, 47, 82, 125, 139
Romano, Alberico, 48
Romano, Ezzelino, 48, 87-88, 94, 123-24, 126-28, 149, 157, 164
de' Rossi, Niccolò, 83
de' Rossi, Pietro, 314
Rossi, Roberto, 401, 433, 445-47
Rubinstein, Nicolai, 424
Rustichello of Pisa, 51-52

Sabbadini, Remigio, 339n-340n, 346n
Sabellico, Marcantonio, 22, 242
Sallust, 142-143, 182, 187-88, 191-192
Salutati, Coluccio, 22, 28, 122, 161, 196, 204, 224, 226, 230, 245, 260, 275, 290, 292-339, 346-49, 351-52, 361-63, 372, 373, 383-85, 392, 394-404, 409, 414-17, 419, 421, 423, 426-27, 429, 432-36, 439, 443-45, 449, 453, 459, 468, 470, 475, 478, 497, 512-13
Saluzzo, Count of, 41
Sapegno, Natalino, 19-21
Savonarola, Girolamo, 213
della Scala family, 166
della Scala, Cangrande, 120, 124, 130, 146, 151-153, 159, 163-164, 166
della Scala, Manetto, 186
da Scarperia, Jacopo, 395, 445
Scipio Africanus, 271-72, 281, 470
Scotus, Duns. *See* Duns Scotus.
Seigel, Jerrold, 424
Seneca the Elder, 388
Seneca the Younger, 58-60, 62, 100, 115-16, 122-23, 125-28, 132, 168, 190, 193, 196, 226, 228, 250, 257, 260, 274, 295, 321, 326, 351, 375, 388, 392, 425, 493
Senuccio del Bene, 229
Sermini, Pietro, 433
Sidonius, 324
Siginulfo, Bartolomeo, 193
Silvestri, Domenico, 444
Simintendi, Arrigo da Prato, 192
Simone d'Arezzo, 233, 235
Sinon, 368
Skinner, Quentin, 5-6, 63n-64n, 213n
Smith, Christine, 343n
Soperano, Giovanni, 138
Sordello, 47
St. Justina, 153
Statius, 96-98, 100, 133, 238
Stefanardo da Vimercate, 52, 66, 69-71, 75-78, 94, 99, 116
Strozzi, Nanni, 423, 431, 472, 484, 503
Strozzi, Palla, 423, 445
Suetonius, 118, 142-143, 182
Sulla, 314, 487-88

Tacitus, 430
deTalleyrand, Elie, Cardinal, 268
Tanto dei Tanti, 87, 162
Tanturli, Giuliano, 513
Tarquin, 435
Terence, 225, 402-03
Thomas of Capua, 310
Thomas of Messina, 240
Tibullus, 97-98, 100
Titus, 281, 286
Tommaso di Sarzana. *See* Nicholas V.
della Torre, Pagano, 115, 147
della Tosa, Davizzo, 178
Trajan, 281, 286
Traversari, Ambrogio, 393, 504
Travesi, Giovanni, 388
Trevisan, Zaccaria, 458-62, 465, 475
Trinkaus, Charles, 3
Trogus, Pompeius, 99

Uc de Saint Circ, 47-49
Uguccione of Pisa, 320
Ugurgieri, Ciampolo degli, 191-192
Urban V, 365
Urso da Genova, 52, 66, 68-69, 71-75, 77-78, 94, 99, 101, 116

Valerius Maximus, 189-193, 293, 326
Valerius, Marcus, 37-39, 67
Valla, Lorenzo, 402, 503
Varro, 400
Vegetius, Flavius, 186
Venier, Antonio, 457
Ventura da Foro di Longulo, 86, 89-90, 136
Vergerio, Pierpaolo, 338, 366, 370-89, 393, 407-08, 418, 428, 433, 440, 443, 450-51, 458-59, 466, 513
del Virgilio, Giovanni, 117, 136, 196, 219, 231, 236-38, 292-93, 509-10
Vespasian, 281
Villani, Filippo 233; Giovanni 180, 191-192, 194-195, 205, 359
Vincent of Beauvais, 167, 203, 282-83, 291
Virgil, 24, 31, 35, 38, 73, 94, 115, 133, 157, 191-192, 199, 217-19, 220-21, 232-33, 238-39, 253, 256, 262-263, 265, 295, 315-16, 326, 375, 399, 402-03, 435-36
Visconti family, 299, 301, 306, 373-74, 429-30, 476-77, 479, 484, 489
Visconti, Bernabò, 307
Visconti, Filippo Maria, 455, 480, 488, 491
Visconti, Giangaleazzo, 314, 377, 388, 410, 420, 478-79, 487, 490-91
Visconti, Ottone, 77
Visdomini, Neri de', 177
Vittorino da Feltre, 338, 341

Ward, John O., 352n, 353n
Walter of Châtillon, 37-38, 76
Weiss, Roberto, 18-19, 104n
Wieruszowski, Helene, 33n-34n, 225n

Zabarella, Francesco, 224, 373
Zambeccari, Giovanni, 332
Zambonino di Bartolomeo, 112
Zambono di Andrea, 106-08, 112, 163
Zanobi da Strada, 191, 229, 295, 298, 444
Zeno, Carlo, 470
Zonarini, Giuliano, 309-10

INDEX OF PLACES

Africa, 470
Ancona, 308-09
Arezzo, 89, 180, 196, 232, 453, 492
Asia, 492
Athens, 410, 412-14, 422
Attica, 412
Avignon, 65, 145, 214, 231-33, 235-39, 244, 284-85, 287-89, 298, 301, 305, 346, 364-65

Balkans, 457
Basel, 484
Bassano, 109
Bergamo, 388, 463, 465
Black Sea, 98
Bologna, 15, 35, 88-89, 93, 122, 177, 182, 196, 219, 222-23, 228-29, 232, 236-39, 292-94, 298, 309, 347, 360, 372-73, 458-59, 489-90, 496, 498
Borgo-a-Buggiano, 296
Brescia, 44, 140-141, 164, 172
Buggiano, 296
Byzantium, 85-86

Capodistria, 371
Carolingian Empire, 13
Carpentras, 232
Castille, 178
Cesena, 238
Chioggia, 120, 146, 458, 467
Cividale, 371
Colle-a-Buggiano, 296
Constantinople, 87
Cremona, 44, 485, 489

Egypt, 330
Emilia, 182
England, 14, 174
Europe, 5, 9, 13, 58, 64, 203, 231, 245, 248, 402; northern, 13-14, 91-92, 202, 206, 245, 260, 292, 496; western, 1, 7, 57, 100, 174, 248, 428

Ferrara, 114, 341-42
Florence, 62, 64, 81, 83, 120, 145, 173-75, 177-79, 183, 187, 193, 196-197, 207, 210-11, 213, 216, 219, 224, 228-29, 231-32, 237, 294-95, 301-302, 307, 310-14, 323, 330-31, 335, 341, 347-49, 359, 363, 365, 367, 372-73, 384, 388, 393-95, 399, 402, 405-06, 408-412, 414-15, 417, 420-31, 433, 435, 444, 447-55, 457-59, 462, 466, 471, 475, 483-89, 491, 493, 498
Forlì, 307, 491-92
France, 3, 5, 14-15, 39, 50, 56, 59, 65, 78, 84, 91, 174, 178, 181, 228, 231, 247, 266, 290, 311, 361, 495-96
Friuli, 371, 471

Genoa, 52, 72, 91, 470
Germany, 14, 109, 488, 496
Gorizia, 471
Greece, 457

Iberian peninsula, 174
Imola, 237
Israel, 330
Istrian peninsula, 163
Italy, 1, 14, 17-18, 20, 25, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 44, 47-48, 50-52, 55-59, 62-66, 78, 87, 91, 93, 103, 120, 133, 135, 164, 170-71, 173, 176, 179, 193, 196, 197, 199, 204, 212, 228, 231-32, 235, 237, 245, 247, 251, 266, 280, 288-90, 292, 299, 302, 307, 313, 322, 347, 353, 357, 360-61, 366, 393, 409, 410, 420, 429, 430, 448, 453, 478, 488, 490-92, 495-97, 505; southern, 50

Jerusalem, 491

Lendinara, 120
Liguria, 40
Lombardy, 40, 52
Lucca, 16, 423

Mantua, 341-42
Milan, 75, 77, 115, 251, 306, 314, 388, 454, 476, 479-80, 482, 484-93, 500
Modena, 42
Montpellier, 232
Montrieux, 251

Naples, 47, 145, 295, 311, 323, 360-61, 496

Olympus, Mount, 414

Padua, 4, 52, 56, 78, 81-82, 84, 87-91, 93-96, 101, 103, 109-10, 112-14, 119-20, 122, 124, 128, 130, 137-139, 145-146, 148-155, 159, 163, 166, 168, 173, 197, 200, 210, 219, 222, 224, 237, 248, 293, 347, 371-72, 374, 377, 384, 436, 441, 450, 453, 457, 459, 462-66, 476, 489-90, 496, 498
Pomposa, 99-100
Paris, 145, 178, 181, 183
Parma, 314
Passignano, 42
Pavia, 15, 225, 388, 463, 465, 476
Perugia, 489
Pescia, 302
Piacenza, 44, 174
Piedmont, 40
Pisa, 91, 175, 176n, 312, 492
Pistoia, 42, 181, 302
Prague, 287
Prato, 214
Provence, 42, 47-48, 50, 251, 347
Pyrenees, 415

Ravenna, 221, 346
Reggio Emilia, 44
Rheims, 13
Rimini, 349
Rome, 56, 191, 277, 284, 287-89, 291, 295-96, 298-300, 301, 309, 312, 346, 361, 365-66, 394-95, 398, 459
Rome, ancient, 56-58, 62-64, 65, 150, 169, 191, 205, 211-12, 277, 280-81, 291, 312-13, 331-34, 408, 411, 419-20, 429-30, 468, 470, 471, 474-75, 487, 492
Rovigo, 109

Savoy, 47
Sicily, 50
Siena, 174, 237, 489
Smyrna, 412
Sparta, 410
Stignano, 292, 294, 296

Thebes, 53
Todi, 296
Treviso, 48-49, 52, 82-83, 89, 91, 139, 141, 219
Troy, 148, 314, 368
Tuscany, 42, 173, 175-77, 179-83, 193, 197, 199-200, 207, 210, 224-25, 299, 301, 490, 493
Tyrol, 471

Uzzano, 296

Valdinievole, 299
Vaucluse, 261
Veneto, 4, 17, 47-48, 50-52, 82-87, 90-91, 109, 113, 122-23, 129, 141, 166, 168, 175, 193, 197, 199-200, 219, 223, 229, 490, 496
Venice, 82-87, 110, 162-163, 341, 346, 407, 454-56, 458-60, 462-63, 465, 468-75, 492, 496
Ventoux, Mount, 414
Vercelli, 332, 340
Verona, 42, 52, 72, 82, 91, 109, 114, 120, 125, 162-163, 166-168, 219, 279-80, 341, 351, 441, 457
Vicenza, 82, 91, 109, 152, 162, 166, 373, 441, 457
Viterbo, 394
Volterra, 492

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

abacus school, 194-195, 444
active and contemplative lives, conflict between, 108, 186, 296, 327-30, 383, 385, 392-93, 419, 431, 458
Ad Herennium, 16, 25, 89, 183-84, 204, 352-53, 363-64, 366, 374, 379, 381, 388, 414
Areopagites of Athens, 410
Albigensian Crusade, 47
allegory, 11-12, 246, 319, 323
Antenor, 56, 148
antiqui, 37-39
ars arengandi, 5, 183, 203, 354-55, 358-59, 379, 443
ars dictaminis, 1, 2, 5-6, 16-17, 25, 57, 88-89, 94, 133, 135-38, 165, 172, 182-83, 185, 203, 214-16, 226, 264-266, 269, 275, 294, 296, 303, 307-09, 310-11, 317, 351-55, 358, 362, 365, 374, 379, 443, 497, 509
ars predicandi, 5, 203, 356-58, 362, 374, 379-80, 443
artes, 35, 79-80
artes poetrie (manuals of poetic composition), 38-39, 76, 133, 143, 181, 203, 239
Arthurian cycle, 42
auctores, 79, 202
Auliver, 83

Bianchi, 322
Belloveso, 487
Bible, 61, 159, 299-300, 362
birthday, celebration of, 118, 382

caritas. *See* patriotism, Salutati's.
Carmen de gestis Frederici I, 67-68
Carolingian Renaissance, 12-13
Carolingian script, 93-94
cathedral library, 166-167, 279
cathedral schools, 14, 15, 16, 358
censors of Rome, 410
chancellor of Florence, duties of, 300
Chioggia, War of, 457
chivalric ethic, 61, 64, 197, 200, 209, 425-26, 493, 499
Christianity, 98, 157, 160, 186, 249, 252, 258; conflict with pagan literature, 157-161, 171, 245-246, 334-37, 400, 439; in early humanism, 108, 156-161, 250; value of pagan literature for, 245-246, 249, 252-255, 257, 259, 300, 319, 337, 382
Ciceronianism, 474-77, 493-94, 497-505, 396-97, 387-91, 367-70, 385-87, 374-79, 338-46, 392-93, 432-33, 439-42; Christian response to, 503-05
cittadini, 83
civic ethic, 46, 55, 61, 64-65, 128-29, 173, 179, 197, 200-201, 209, 425-26, 442, 450, 483, 493, 499
civic humanism, 21, 386, 404-14, 419-31, 455, 493-94, 499-505; 'signorial,' 386-87, 482-83, 493-94
classicism, 6, 28, 272, 290; French 6, 35
classicizing, 17-18, 24-25, 27-29, 36, 38-39, 55, 65-68, 71, 73, 76, 78, 85, 99, 105, 114-16, 121, 128, 130, 132-134, 139, 141, 145, 163, 166, 168, 170, 173, 197, 200, 210, 219, 223, 226, 228, 233, 235, 246, 266, 270-273, 275, 298, 317, 320-22, 363, 369, 380, 404, 440, 443, 451, 453, 462, 474, 497, 500, 504, 509, 514; vs. classical, 28
colores rhetorici, 8, 135, 235, 269, 301, 352, 390, 414, 464
communes, 40, 43-45, 51, 55, 82, 119, 129, 145, 147, 149, 155, 174-75, 199-201, 212, 226, 237-38, 287, 296, 304, 308, 312, 354, 356, 371, 408, 464
Constance, Treaty of, 40, 44
contemplative life. *See* active and contemplative lives.
Conti di antichi cavalieri, 180
court culture, 41, 48, 50-51, 54, 65, 197-198, 496; Hohenstaufen (*magna curia*), 41, 50; Italian 41-42
cursus, 26, 29, 136-138, 142, 165, 169, 185, 273, 301, 365, 368, 381, 509-14

Devotio moderna, 245
dialect, Bolognese, 354-55; Roman, 181; Sicilian, 50, 176, 193; Tuscan, 21, 52,

83, 173, 175-76, 180, 185, 188, 199, 206, 210, 221, 411; of the Veneto, 48. *See also* vernacular.
dictatores, 1, 2, 5, 17, 89, 136-137, 170, 182-83, 204, 207, 245, 296, 309, 352, 358, 510-11
diplomacy, Latin the language of, 304, 361; vernacular the language of, 304-05, 361, 451
Donadello, 195
Donat provensal, 48

education, 14, 15, 16, 3, 34n, 87, 91, 95, 137, 193-195, 197, 202, 293, 358; ancient, 7-8; in Bologna, 93n; humanist, 1, 210, 229, 257, 290, 317, 335, 377, 383, 428, 444, 446-47, 450-51, 454, 467, 475-77, 481, 493, 505-07; Italian, 16, 34, 36, 93; medieval, 11-17; structure of 7-8, 29, 88-93, 133-135, 195-197, 214, 257, 353, 370, 372, 450, 505.
ekphrasis, 25, 143, 366, 369, 408, 414, 443
elegiac verse. *See* poetry, elegiac.
elision, 67, 511
eloquence, 202-04, 245, 296-97, 306, 315, 323, 325-26, 339-42, 344-45, 362-63, 375-77, 387, 390, 394, 400, 402-03, 406, 411, 427-28, 443, 454, 466, 476, 488; as moral force, 201, 243-244, 267, 297, 300, 352, 401; superior to logic, 244
Enlightenment, 29
ephors of Sparta, 410
epic, 17, 42, 71, 76-77, 94, 99, 116, 130, 132, 134, 151, 159, 222; French 41-42, 51, 101

factionalism, 16, 44, 59-60, 76, 82, 109-10, 129, 145, 150, 152, 164, 425, 442, 467, 479, 499
Li fait des Romains, 85, 181, 191
Fatti di Cesare, 184, 191
Fior di virtù, 59, 62
Fiori e vita di filosafi e d'altri savi e d'imperadori, 180
fortune vs. virtue, 296; vs. will, 75-76, 151, 244-245, 331
Frammento papafava, 84
French literary hegemony, 79; decline in Italy, 199-200
friendship, 59, 105; Salutati on, 296, 334-35

Ghibellines, 145, 175, 178, 312, 314, 365
grammar, 1-2, 6-8, 13-14, 17, 31-36, 52, 55, 78-79, 86, 88-93, 95, 114, 132-134, 191, 194, 237, 244, 310, 371, 403, 443-45
Guelfs, 145, 175, 302, 312, 314, 365, 410

historical perspective, 172, 276-83, 452, 500-02. *See also* humanist historical writing; time, concept of
humanism, 1-6, 17-19, 21-30, 54, 64, 78, 81, 92-93, 156, 163, 166-167, 173, 204-205, 207, 213, 221, 229, 259, 269, 274, 290, 293, 295, 311, 315-17, 323, 350, 370-71, 392, 420, 430, 440, 443, 445, 456, 465, 476-77, 493, 495, 500, 505-07; art criticism 417; Christian (*see also* humanism, Petrarchan), 231, 270, 292, 497, 503-04; interpretations of Cicero's career, 385-86; civic, 21, 386-87, 404-14, 419-31, 455, 482-83, 493-94; definition, 22; and education (*see* education, humanist); Florence as center of, 292; and origins of Florence, 408-09, 430, 488; French, 1; French influence on, 4, 495-96; and history, 139-56, 170-72, 276-86, 287, 311, 315, 449-50, 491; humanists' imitation of Romans, 304, 451-52 (*see also* style, imitation of classical); Italian, 1, 4, 6, 18, 21, 31, 231, 260; Milanese, 476-94; moral commitment, 240-242, 245, 267, 289, 440-41, 462; oratorical, 30, 493; origins of, 1-7, 17-21, 78, 245, 339, 341, 495-97, 497; Petrarchan, 243, 246, 259-260, 286, 289-91, 340, 370, 392, 419, 441, 449, 454, 458, 497; and political elite, 1, 315, 370-71, 430, 442, 444, 447-48, 458, 505; and origins of Renaissance, 30; tolerance, 318, 439, 452; Trecento, 2, 156, 337, 351, 370, 374, 402, 416, 440; values 29, 260; Venetian, 85-89, 161-62, 371, 384, 454-475; Veronese, 226; attitudes towards wealth, 268
humanists, conflict among, 395-96, 399, 402

imitation. *See* style, imitation of classical.
Inquisition, 149
Istoria fiorentina, 179

knights, 44-46, 208

Lamenta della buona sposa padovanna, 84
language, historical development of, 322-325, 394, 401, 403, 437
language games, 30
langue d'oc, 46, 51, 79, 101
langue d'oil, 46, 51, 79, 82, 101, 182
law, 4, 12, 15, 36, 57, 85, 92-93, 172, 197, 225, 268, 353, 459; canon, 16, 57, 92, 373; Roman, 14-15, 36, 57, 85, 92, 171, 373, 411, 500; statute, 171; study of, 1, 15, 17, 88, 92-93, 95; superior to medicine, 328-29
lawyers, 2, 14-17, 20, 34-36, 57, 61, 87-88, 92-93, 96, 195, 302, 358, 362-63, 371, 444, 500
leonine verse, 66n, 234
letter writing, 122, 135-139, 172, 223, 264-266, 275, 279, 294, 299, 302-03, 307, 309, 311, 344, 351, 353, 365. *See also missive.*
literacy, 14, 132, 193, 197, 229, 303-04, 355, 358, 361
literature, 32, 43, 48, 55, 83-84, 93, 243, 249, 255; ancient, 33-36, 39, 49, 65, 79-80, 86, 89-90, 93-95, 112, 132, 172, 196-199, 205, 208, 214-15, 219, 231-32, 237, 245-246, 250, 255, 261, 269, 339, 364, 393, 402, 445, 450; French, 46, 55, 83, 175, 197; Latin, 36, 49, 54, 65, 80, 115, 132-133, 197, 200-201, 258, 324, 444, 446; moral, 59, 62, 106, 132, 170, 179, 195, 203, 239-42, 247, 249-250, 255-260, 267-69, 278-79, 311, 319, 321, 426, 498; provençal, 47-49, 83, 175; romance, 42, 46, 51-52, 198; vernacular, 21, 54, 83-85, 132, 200, 205, 229, 453, 495, 496, 499
logic, 12-15, 49, 57, 79, 85, 88, 114, 203, 353
logic, new (*logica nova*), 13-14, 203

magic, 97
mannerism, 68, 71, 76
medicine, inferior to law, 328-29
meter, 8, 12, 26-27, 29, 39, 52, 66-69, 71, 76-77, 100, 116, 121, 125-26, 130, 136-138, 142, 157, 159-160, 162, 165, 168, 176, 185, 227, 273, 365, 368, 381, 509-14
milites, 44-46, 208
missive, and Florentine foreign policy, 300-315; Salutati's writing strategy for, 310, 423, 449
monarchy, justification of, 211-12, 334, 386, 419, 478-81
Montaperti, battle of, 178

Narcisse, 181
new logic (*logica nova*), 13-14, 203
noble status, 45
nominalism, 245, 276n
notaries, 2, 14, 20, 58, 60-61, 72, 81, 86, 88, 90-93, 95, 106, 110, 119, 130, 132, 134, 163, 170, 179, 184, 193, 195, 296, 298, 323, 371, 444, 455
Novellino, 180

Octo auctores, 133-134, 195
Oculus pastoralis, 59, 354
oligarchy, Florentine government as, 424, 426-27
oration, 5, 8-12, 25, 78, 93, 184, 269, 303, 338, 344, 349, 351-52, 354, 358-61, 363-64, 366, 368, 374, 377, 379-80, 383-84, 388, 390, 403, 424, 427-28, 435, 438, 441, 443-44, 451, 459-60, 462-64, 466, 474-75, 490, 492, 497-98, 503
oratory, 12, 202-203, 205, 275, 350, 352, 359, 362-63, 366, 368-71, 374-75, 377, 381, 383, 387-89, 397, 401, 438, 440, 450-51, 453-54, 459, 465-66, 476-77, 489-90, 493
Ordinances of Justice (Florence), 120
orthography, 295, 320

Palatine Society of Paduan Notaries, 130
patriotism, Petrarch's, 289; Salutati's, 296-97, 330, 334
period, Ciceronian, defined, 379
perspective, linear, 415-19, 486, 501
philology, 166-168, 208, 232-33, 235, 286, 290, 295, 338, 403, 420, 476, 495
Philomena 181
Physiologus, 133
Piramus, 181

podestà, 45, 60, 72, 120, 140-141, 162, 184, 225, 236,, 354, 361, 459
poet-theologian, Aristotle's conception of, 158
poetry, 4, 6-9, 12, 15, 25-27, 36-40, 48, 50, 52, 67-68, 76, 83-84, 93-100, 103, 110, 116-117, 128, 130, 132-135, 157-158, 160, 170, 181-82, 185, 188-89, 221, 233, 237-38, 243, 275, 282, 295, 315, 317, 339, 352, 394, 399, 436, 466, 496-97; Sicilian school, 50-51; ancient 159, 167, 214, 216, 221, 279, 319, 450-51; bucolic, 221, 223, 236, 261, 269, 435; burlesque 177; classicizing, 115, 133-134; elegiac, 66, 68, 76, 96, 234; French, 39, 42, 47, 52, 54-55, 67, 99, 101; Italian, 50, 84, 116, 176; Latin, 14, 17, 21, 25, 34, 36, 52, 54, 66-67, 76, 79, 99, 101-02, 112, 116, 133, 171, 221, 235, 264, 317; love, 102, 269; lyric, 42, 47, 51, 120, 170, 176-77, 218; merits of children explored in 106-08, 163; nature of friendship explored in, 105; pagan, 159, 163, 250, 252; pastoral 25; provençal, 47-48, 50-52, 54-55, 90, 101-02; Sicilian, 175-76; Tuscan, 177, 186; vernacular, 40-41, 49, 50, 52-53, 79, 83-84, 112, 176, 215, 298. *See also* metric; style.
political thought, Petrarch's, 287-89; Salutati's, 296-97, 331-34; Vergerio's, 384-87
populares 44, 46
'prehumanists,' 18-21, 495
primo popolo, 175, 201, 207
propaganda, 124, 310-14, 424, 427, 449, 479, 484, 490
prophecy, 52, 255, 281
prose, 8-9, 17, 22, 24-27, 37, 51-52, 94, 130, 134, 137, 139, 142, 146, 169, 178, 180, 182, 185, 189, 226, 233, 243, 267, 269, 275, 279, 282, 315, 317, 352, 368, 381, 392, 394, 399, 407, 436, 443, 460, 466, 485, 493
prose, superior to poetry according to Salutati, 316, 318
prosopopoeia, Dante Alighieri's use of, 217
Proverbia quae dicuntur super natura feminarum, 84
public vs. private, 5, 10, 370n, 498-99
reading practices, 7, 15, 34n, 122, 132-34, 137, 142, 143-44, 168, 194-97, 204, 210-11, 215-16, 228, 233, 247-50, 256, 262, 290, 294, 303-05, 309, 358-63, 453-54. 506
Reformation, Catholic, 245; Protestant, 245
Renaissance, 4-5, 9-10, 18, 29-30, 34, 64, 100; French, 495, origin of, 30; Carolingian, 12-13; twelfth-century, 13-14
republicanism, 154-56, 206-07, 210-13, 385, 408-09, 412-13, 419-23, 427-28, 430, 440, 451, 470, 479, 483, 491-92, 493, 499
republics, theory of, 147-54, 296-97; Salutati's, 331-34
rhetoric, 1-2, 4-14, 17, 25, 33, 57, 79, 88, 90-91, 93, 136, 182, 201-204, 207, 232, 244-245, 269, 310, 348, 350, 352, 355-56, 358, 362-63, 366-70, 373, 389, 393, 400, 418-19, 438, 441, 443-45, 450-51, 454, 464, 466, 476, 492, 497, 506
rhetorical colors. *See colores rhetorici.*
rhyme, 38, 53-54, 104-05; leonine, 66n, 234

schism, papal, 441
Scholasticism, 14, 62-63, 154-156, 201n, 210-13, 216-17, 238-39, 244-245, 248, 253n, 257-58, 267-69, 275, 276n, 318-19, 320-322, 327, 330, 335-37, 353, 400-01, 421, 432n, 433, 434-35, 441, 443, 451; Paris the center of, 178
simile, Dante's use of, 218; revived by early humanists, 25
skepticism, 29, 157
social mobility, 43, 56, 82, 174-75, 199, 422-23
speechmaking. *See* oration.
spiritual vs. temporal power, 247-248, 251
Stoicism, 76, 296
style, 103, 105, 111, 139, 165, 169, 208, 223, 233, 263, 265-266, 268-270, 274-75, 278, 286, 305-06, 317-18, 320-21, 324, 326, 338-39, 341-45, 351, 370, 375, 388, 394, 398, 401-02, 405, 407, 454, 462, 466, 468, 486, 493, 500, 502; stylistic change, 22, 30,

67-68, 78, 498; imitation of classical, 22-28, 39, 68, 70, 78, 102, 116, 122, 128, 130, 172, 200, 210, 240, 248, 259-261, 263-264, 267, 269-70, 272, 275, 278, 284, 290, 294, 304, 320, 337, 344, 350-51, 368, 374, 384, 387, 390, 392-94, 396-97, 404, 413, 418, 433, 460, 462, 475, 496, 500. *See also* meter; poetry.
stylistic analysis, importance of for understanding humanism, 22-25
syllogism, 10, 15

tenzone, 102
theology, 12-14, 159, 203; role of reason in, 252n-253n
Thessalia, battle of, 333
time, concept of, 118, 172-73, 282-83; 501-02; Petrarch's, 276-82
tragedy, definition of in Middle Ages, 124-25
translation, 85, 145, 157, 180, 182, 190-191, 193, 200-201, 204-205, 207-210, 467, 497, 499; aesthetic quality of, 187; approaches to, 181, 185, 200; classical writers into French, 181-82, 190; classical writers into Tuscan, 180, 182-83, 185-86, 188, 190, 352, 453, 498; Florence as the center of, 207, 453-54; French into Roman dialect, 181; French into Tuscan, 178, 181, 193 Latin into Tuscan, 173, 178, 208; problems involved in, 187-88; slippage 208-209
Treaty of Constance, 40, 44
Treaty of Treviso, 110
troubadours, 41-42, 46-48, 51, 176
twelfth-century Renaissance, 13-14
tyranny, legitimate resistance to, 332; origins of, 212

vernacular, blended with Latin, 227; first examples of *ars arengandi* in, 183; language of public discourse, 451-52; scorn for, 222; teaching of, in Florence, 193. See also dialect.
vetustas, 28, 38, 74, 102, 116, 122, 160, 190, 210, 274, 326, 397-98, 402-03, 500
vita activa, 11. *See also* active and contemplative lives.
vita contemplativa, 11. *See also* active and contemplatives lives.

War of Chioggia, 457
War of the Eight Saints. *See* War, Florence vs. papacy.
war, Florence vs. Milan, 306, 313; Florence vs. papacy, 302, 305, 312
will. *See* fortune vs. will.
Will, Divine, 149, 151, 331, 333, 471
will vs. intellect, 243-44; 327-30

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION THOUGHT

EDITED BY HEIKO A. OBERMAN

1. DOUGLASS, E. J. D. *Justification in Late Medieval Preaching.* 2nd ed. 1989
2. WILLIS, E. D. *Calvin's Catholic Christology.* 1966 *out of print*
3. POST, R. R. *The Modern Devotion.* 1968 *out of print*
4. STEINMETZ, D. C. *Misericordia Dei.* The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz. 1968 *out of print*
5. O'MALLEY, J. W. *Giles of Viterbo on Church and Reform.* 1968 *out of print*
6. OZMENT, S. E. *Homo Spiritualis.* The Anthropology of Tauler, Gerson and Luther. 1969
7. PASCOE, L. B. *Jean Gerson: Principles of Church Reform.* 1973 *out of print*
8. HENDRIX, S. H. *Ecclesia in Via.* Medieval Psalms Exegesis and the *Dictata super Psalterium* (1513-1515) of Martin Luther. 1974
9. TREXLER, R. C. *The Spiritual Power.* Republican Florence under Interdict. 1974
10. TRINKAUS, Ch. with OBERMAN, H. A. (eds.). *The Pursuit of Holiness.* 1974 *out of print*
11. SIDER, R. J. *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt.* 1974
12. HAGEN, K. *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther.* 1974
13. MOORE, Jr., W. L. *Annotatiunculae D. Iohanne Eckio Praelectore.* 1976
14. OBERMAN, H. A. with BRADY, Jr., Th. A. (eds.). *Itinerarium Italicum.* Dedicated to Paul Oskar Kristeller. 1975
15. KEMPFF, D. *A Bibliography of Calviniana.* 1959-1974. 1975 *out of print*
16. WINDHORST, C. *Täuferisches Taufverständnis.* 1976
17. KITTELSON, J. M. *Wolfgang Capito.* 1975
18. DONNELLY, J. P. *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace.* 1976
19. LAMPING, A. J. *Ulrichus Velenus (Oldřich Velenský) and his Treatise against the Papacy.* 1976
20. BAYLOR, M. G. *Action and Person.* Conscience in Late Scholasticism and the Young Luther. 1977
21. COURTENAY, W. J. *Adam Wodeham.* 1978
22. BRADY, Jr., Th. A. *Ruling Class, Regime and Reformation at Strasbourg, 1520-1555.* 1978
23. KLAASSEN, W. *Michael Gaismair.* 1978
24. BERNSTEIN, A. E. *Pierre d'Ailly and the Blanchard Affair.* 1978
25. BUCER, Martin. *Correspondance.* Tome I (Jusqu'en 1524). Publié par J. Rott. 1979
26. POSTHUMUS MEYJES, G. H. M. *Jean Gerson et l'Assemblée de Vincennes (1329).* 1978
27. VIVES, Juan Luis. *In Pseudodialecticos.* Ed. by Ch. Fantazzi. 1979
28. BORNERT, R. *La Réforme Protestante du Culte à Strasbourg au XVI^{e} siècle (1523-1598).* 1981
29. SEBASTIAN CASTELLIO. *De Arte Dubitandi.* Ed. by E. Feist Hirsch. 1981
30. BUCER, Martin. *Opera Latina.* Vol I. Publié par C. Augustijn, P. Fraenkel, M. Lienhard. 1982
31. BÜSSER, F. *Wurzeln der Reformation in Zürich.* 1985 *out of print*
32. FARGE, J. K. *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France.* 1985
33. 34. BUCER, Martin. *Etudes sur les relations de Bucer avec les Pays-Bas.* I. Etudes; II. Documents. Par J. V. Pollet. 1985
35. HELLER, H. *The Conquest of Poverty.* The Calvinist Revolt in Sixteenth Century France. 1986

36. MEERHOFF, K. *Rhétorique et poétique au XVI^e siècle en France.* 1986
37. GERRITS, G. H. *Inter timorem et spem.* Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen. 1986
38. ANGELO POLIZIANO. *Lamia.* Ed. by A. Wesseling. 1986
39. BRAW, C. *Bücher im Staube.* Die Theologie Johann Arndts in ihrem Verhältnis zur Mystik. 1986
40. BUCER, Martin. *Opera Latina.* Vol. II. Enarratio in Evangelion Iohannis (1528, 1530, 1536). Publié par I. Backus. 1988
41. BUCER, Martin. *Opera Latina*. Vol. III. Martin Bucer and Matthew Parker: Florilegium Patristicum. Edition critique. Publié par P. Fraenkel. 1988
42. BUCER, Martin. *Opera Latina*. Vol. IV. Consilium Theologicum Privatim Conscriptum. Publié par P. Fraenkel. 1988
43. BUCER, Martin. *Correspondance.* Tome II (1524-1526). Publié par J. Rott. 1989
44. RASMUSSEN, T. *Inimici Ecclesiae.* Das ekklesiologische Feindbild in Luthers "Dictata super Psalterium" (1513-1515) im Horizont der theologischen Tradition. 1989
45. POLLET, J. *Julius Pflug et la crise religieuse dans l'Allemagne du XVI^e siècle.* Essai de synthèse biographique et théologique. 1990
46. BUBENHEIMER, U. *Thomas Müntzer.* Herkunft und Bildung. 1989
47. BAUMAN, C. *The Spiritual Legacy of Hans Denck.* Interpretation and Translation of Key Texts. 1991
48. OBERMAN, H. A. and JAMES, F. A., III (eds.). in cooperation with SAAK, E. L. *Via Augustini.* Augustine in the Later Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation: Essays in Honor of Damasus Trapp. 1991 *out of print*
49. SEIDEL MENCHI, S. *Erasmus als Ketzer.* Reformation und Inquisition im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts. 1993
50. SCHILLING, H. *Religion, Political Culture, and the Emergence of Early Modern Society.* Essays in German and Dutch History. 1992
51. DYKEMA, P. A. and OBERMAN, H. A. (eds.). *Anticlericalism in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe.* 2nd ed. 1994
52. 53. KRIEGER, Chr. and LIENHARD, M. (eds.). *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe.* Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991). 1993
54. SCREECH, M. A. *Clément Marot: A Renaissance Poet discovers the World.* Lutheranism, Fabrism and Calvinism in the Royal Courts of France and of Navarre and in the Ducal Court of Ferrara. 1994
55. GOW, A. C. *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600.* 1995
56. BUCER, Martin. *Correspondance.* Tome III (1527-1529). Publié par Chr. Krieger et J. Rott. 1989
57. SPIJKER, W. VAN 'T. *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer.* Translated by J. Vriend (text) and L.D. Bierma (notes). 1996
58. GRAHAM, M.F. *The Uses of Reform.* 'Godly Discipline' and Popular Behavior in Scotland and Beyond, 1560-1610. 1996
59. AUGUSTIJN, C. *Erasmus. Der Humanist als Theologe und Kirchenreformer.* 1996
60. McCOOG SJ, T. M. *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541-1588.* 'Our Way of Proceeding?' 1996
61. FISCHER, N. und KOBELT-GROCH, M. (Hrsg.). *Außenseiter zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit.* Festschrift für Hans-Jürgen Goertz zum 60. Geburtstag. 1997
62. NIEDEN, M. *Organum Deitatis.* Die Christologie des Thomas de Vio Cajetan. 1997
63. BAST, R.J. *Honor Your Fathers.* Catechisms and the Emergence of a Patriarchal Ideology in Germany, 1400-1600. 1997
64. ROBBINS, K.C. *City on the Ocean Sea: La Rochelle, 1530-1650.* Urban Society, Religion, and Politics on the French Atlantic Frontier. 1997
65. BLICKLE, P. *From the Communal Reformation to the Revolution of the Common Man.* 1998
66. FELMBERG, B. A. R. *Die Ablaßtheorie Kardinal Cajetans (1469-1534).* 1998

67. CUNEO, P. F. *Art and Politics in Early Modern Germany*. Jörg Breu the Elder and the Fashioning of Political Identity, ca. 1475-1536. 1998
68. BRADY, Jr., Th. A. *Communities, Politics, and Reformation in Early Modern Europe.* 1998
69. McKEE, E. A. *The Writings of Katharina Schütz Zell.* 1. The Life and Thought of a Sixteenth-Century Reformer. 2. A Critical Edition. 1998
70. BOSTICK, C. V. *The Antichrist and the Lollards.* Apocalyticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England. 1998
71. BOYLE, M. O'ROURKE. *Senses of Touch.* Human Dignity and Deformity from Michelangelo to Calvin. 1998
72. TYLER, J.J. *Lord of the Sacred City*. The *Episcopus Exclusus* in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany. 1999

Prospectus available on request

BRILL — P.O.B. 9000 — 2300 PA LEIDEN — THE NETHERLANDS